DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 071 043 24 CS 000 301

AUTHOR Tidwell, Kenneth W.; And Others
TITLE Field Trial of Wisconsin Design for Reading Skill Development and CEMREL Aesthetic Education Program. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Southeastern Education Lab., Atlanta, Ga.
SPONS AGENCY National Center for Educational Research and Development (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO BR-1-0718
PUB DATE Oct 72
GRANT OEG-0-71-3578
NOTE 128p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS *Aesthetic Education; Art Education; Beginning Reading; Cultural Enrichment; *Elementary Grades; Reading; *Reading Instruction; *Reading Skills; *Word Recognition; Word Study Skills
IDENTIFIERS *CEMREL Inc; Wisconsin R and D Center for Cognitive Learning

ABSTRACT

This report describes field test activities for the Wisconsin Design for Reading Skill Development and for CEMREL's Aesthetic Education Program. The word attack element of the Design was implemented in schools in Alabama, Florida, and Georgia in the 1970-71 school year. The analysis of progress in word attach and other reading skills of children with two years' experience in the Word Attack program determined that the children showed progressive increases on the evaluation tests for some skills and slight decreases for others. The participating schools plan to continue their work with the Wisconsin program in 1972 and beyond. CEMREL's Aesthetic Education Program was tested in thirty-one schools in Alabama, Florida, and Georgia. The primary purpose of the field trial was to evaluate the relationship between CEMREL's Program and the total school instructional program. The results of the field trial indicated that the Program was successful and that it could be installed with a minimum amount of teacher training. Schools will continue to use the Program during 1972-73. (See also ED 048 274 and ED 056 829 for related documents.) (Pages 112-22 may be illegible in reproduction due to small type.) (Author/WR)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 071043

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Final Report

Project No. 1-0718
Grant No. OEGO-71-3578

Field Trial of Wisconsin Design for Reading Skill Development and CEMREL Aesthetic Education Program

Kenneth W. Tidwell, Shelby L. Johnson, and Helen C. Lynch
Southeastern Education Laboratory
1750 Old Springhouse Lane, Suite 207
Atlanta, Georgia 30341

October 1972

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
National Center for Educational Research and Development

CS 000 201

ABSTRACT

This report describes field test activities for the Wisconsin Design for Reading Skill Development and CEMREL's Aesthetic Education Program. The Word Attack element of the Design was implemented in schools in Alabama, Florida, and Georgia in the 1970-71 school year. Beginning in November 1971, the program was expanded to the Study Skills element as well as Word Attack. The progress in word attack and other reading skills of children with two years' experience in the Word Attack program was determined. In the second and final year of the field test, children showed progressive increases on the evaluation tests for some skills and slight decreases on others. The schools were pleased with the program and plan to continue their work with the Design in 1972 and beyond.

CEMREL's Aesthetic Education Program, an arts program, was tested in 31 schools in Alabama, Florida, and Georgia. The primary purpose of this field trial was to evaluate the relationship between the Program and the total school instructional program. The Aesthetic Education Program materials were considered a meaningful addition to the curriculum by both teachers and administrators. Results of the field trial indicate that the Program was successful and that it could be installed with a minimum amount of teacher training. Schools will continue to use the Program during 1972-73.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many people have given generously of their time, energy, and ideas to the project reported here. State department personnel and system superintendents spent many hours in briefing sessions and subsequently many more hours laying the groundwork for local implementation in the schools. Principals, lead teachers, coordinators, and specialists graciously accepted responsibility for solving local administrative problems and for maintaining the wide perspective needed for program continuity and smooth coordination. The contributions of the classroom teachers are immeasurable. They graciously endured last minute schedule changes; spent untold hours planning instruction, maintaining records, and recording data; and suffered through lengthy questionnaires. And the students, for whom this is all about, must not be forgotten. They found their ways expertly through the initial confusion of changing schedules, teachers, and rooms; they worked diligently on the tasks at hand; they submitted themselves to often arduous testing; and they created humor when it was needed most.

The Wisconsin Research and Development Center for Cognitive Learning, 1404 Regent Street, Madison, Wisconsin, and CEMREL, Inc., 10646 St. Charles Rock Road, St. Ann, Missouri, have rendered invaluable assistance to the project staff. Special services were provided in the areas of computer analysis of data, teacher orientation, and technical assistance.

CONTENTS

		Page
	LIST OF TABLES	iv
	LIST OF FIGURES	v
I	INTRODUCTION	1
II	WISCONSIN DESIGN FOR READING SKILL DEVELOPMENT	2
	The Product and Field Test Plan	3
	Product Description	4
	Previous Product Evaluation	8
	Field Test Objectives	10
	Target Populations and Site Description	13
	Evaluation Devices and Methods	17
	Conditions for Implementation	22
	Word Attack	25
	Review: First Year of Field Test and Results	25
	Description of Second Year Implementation	28
	Evaluation	30
	Study Skills	41
	Discussion	44
III	AESTHETIC EDUCATION PROGRAM	47
	Aesthetic Education: An Introduction	47
	Product Description	50
	Goals and Outcomes	50
	Field Trial Materials	55
	Field Trial	59
	Product Evaluation Phases	60
	Objectives	63
	Target Population and Field Trial Sites	63
	Description of Implementation	65
	Evaluation	67
	Discussion	78
IV	PROJECTIONS FOR 1972-73	80
	REFERENCES	82
	APPENDIXES	84

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Skill areas and approximate grade equivalents of Design levels	5
2	Field test objectives for Word Attack and Study Skills, 1970-1972	12
3	Design target populations	15
4	Numbers of children participating in Design field test	16
5	Approximate number of regular and irregular words in three frequency groups	18
6	Number of words in each frequency on two types of word lists	19
7	Average number of Word Attack skills mastered by each grade/unit	32
8	Number of children mastering Word Attack skills	34
9	Means on standardized tests in grades 2, 3, and 4	40
10	Break-in testing levels for each grade: Study Skills	42
11	Average percent of children retested in each grade	43
12	Number of schools participating in AEP field test	64

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
1	Design field test timeline	10
2	Mean scores converted to percent on Design tests in grade 1	36
3	Mean scores converted to percent on Design tests in grade 2	37
4	Mean scores converted to percent on Design tests in grade 3	38
5	Mean scores converted to percent on Design tests in grade 4	39

I

INTRODUCTION

The Southeastern Education Laboratory (SEL) was established as a regional educational laboratory in 1965. The mission of SEL was to provide research related services that were needed by educational agencies and institutions that were seeking to improve the quality of education at the pre-elementary, elementary, secondary, and community college levels. Until basic funding was reduced in 1971, SEL engaged in a variety of activities concerning educational research, development, and diffusion.

In June 1971, SEL received a grant from the U. S. Office of Education to disseminate two innovative educational products in the Southeastern region of the United States with primary concern for facilitating the testing programs and providing product maintenance. The two products were the Wisconsin Design for Reading Skill Development, a reading program developed by the Wisconsin Research and Development Center and the Aesthetic Education Program, an arts program developed by CEMREL, Inc. This grant made it possible for SEL to continue for 17 months to assist with the development of two outstanding educational products and at the same time to continue to serve as a diffusion agency for the Southeastern region of the United States.

This report includes the description of the field test activities for the Wisconsin Design for Reading Skill Development and the Aesthetic Education Program and fulfills the responsibilities of the Southeastern Education Laboratory under U. S. Office of Education Grant No. OEGO-71-3578 (Field Trial of Wisconsin Design for Reading Skill Development and CEMREL Aesthetic Education Program).

II

THE WISCONSIN DESIGN FOR READING SKILL DEVELOPMENT

In the spring of 1970 the Laboratory and the Wisconsin Research and Development Center for Cognitive Learning established the framework for a cooperative field test of a Center product in selected schools of the Southeast. The Word Attack element of the Wisconsin Design for Reading Skill Development had already been pilot tested in many schools near the Center and was ready for field test in other areas of the country, with different student and teacher populations and under less rigorous scrutiny. Seven schools in Alabama, Florida, and Georgia were chosen to participate in the 1970-71 field test of the Word Attack element, coordinated by the Laboratory as part of its Communication Skills Program. The field test in 1971-72 included an eighth school, the paired school of one of the original seven, and expanded the program to the Study Skills element as well as Word Attack. The Laboratory has also assisted with general diffusion of information about WDRSD through workshops and other techniques.

This part of the report documents the field test plan, describes field test sites, summarizes briefly 1970-71 results, and evaluates the second year of the field test in terms of differences in reading achievement scores and children's attainment of specific and terminal objectives of the Design. (For a more detailed evaluation of the initial year of the field test, see Johnson 1971a, 1971b.)

THE PRODUCT AND GENERAL FIELD TEST PLAN

A complete system for individually guided education (IGE) at the elementary school level has been under development for several years at the Wisconsin Center. The IGE system was designed as an alternative to age-graded schools, self-contained classrooms, and accompanying instructional practices. The concept of individually guided education is comprehensive in scope and stresses the importance of flexibility in organization and instruction. Fundamental to this approach are statements of goals for the entire school as well as for the individual learner and the continual evaluation of efforts toward achieving those goals.

The seven major components of IGE are:

1. an organization for instruction and related administrative arrangements, together called the multiunit elementary school,
2. a model of instructional programing for the individual student,
3. a model for developing measurement tools and evaluation procedures,
4. curriculum materials, related statements of instructional objectives, and criterion-referenced tests and observation schedules,
5. a program of home/school communications,
6. facilitative environments in school buildings, central and state offices, and teacher education institutions,

7. continuing research and development to generate knowledge and to produce tested materials and procedures. (Klausmeier et al., 1971)

The product field tested by the Southeastern Education Laboratory during 1970-72, the Wisconsin Design for Reading Skill Development (hereafter called the Design), represents one part of the fourth major component of IGE--curriculum materials.

Product Description

The Wisconsin Design provides the structure for a system of individually guided reading in grades K-6 through an outline of reading skills and related behavioral objectives. The means for an individualized approach toward achieving these objectives is provided through assessment, resource materials, and record keeping procedures.

Essentially a statement of the scope and sequence of reading skills for seven elementary school years, the Design is concerned with six general areas of reading: Word Attack, Comprehension, Study Skills, Self-Directed Reading, Interpretive Reading, and Creative Reading. Collectively, the various materials produced for each area represent a systematic effort to:

1. state explicitly (a) the basic reading skills, which by consensus, are essential for competence in reading, and (b) corresponding behavioral objectives for each skill,
2. assess skill development with criterion-referenced tests,
3. provide a framework for instruction, using a variety of procedures and instructional materials,

4. provide a management system for planning instruction, grouping children with common skill needs, and monitoring their learning progress. (Otto & Askov, 1970; Quilling, 1971a)

Each of the six skill areas is divided into four to seven levels of difficulty which correspond in general with most reading programs in the elementary school (Table 1).

TABLE 1. Skill areas and approximate grade equivalents of Design levels

Skill Area	Grade and Level				
	K	1	2	3	4-6
Work Attack	A	B	C	D	---
Comprehension	A	B	C	D	E
Study Skills	A	B	C	D	EFG
Self-Directed Reading	A	B	C	D	E
Interpretive Reading	A	B	C	D	E
Creative Reading	A	B	C	D	E

The field test conducted by the Laboratory in 1970-71 involved only the Word Attack element of the Design; in 1971-72 the Study Skills element was added. A terminal objective has been stated for each element as well as carefully sequenced specific behavioral objectives. For Word Attack an interim objective also exists.

The terminal objective for Word Attack is that the student upon attainment of all Level D skills will be able to attack with independence phonically and/or structurally regular words and will recognize on sight all the words on the Dolch list. Children of average or above average ability and background will attain this objective at least by the end of the fifth year (fourth grade) in school, while others will attain this objective by the end of the seventh year (sixth grade). The interim objective is that the student upon attainment of all Level C skills will be able to attack with independence phonically regular one syllable words and their structure variants, and will recognize on sight the easier 110 words on the Dolch list. Children of average or above average ability and background will attain this abjective by the end of the fourth year in school, while others will attain this objective by the end of the fifth year in school (Quilling, 1971a).

For Study Skills the terminal objective is that the student upon completion of the program will use study skills to locate and derive information from the standard reference sources as

well as from maps, graphs, and tables (Quilling, 1971b). This objective should be attained by the end of the elementary or middle school years.

In addition, 45 specific behavioral objectives have been stated for Word Attack and 75 for Study Skills, each objective related to a particular skill (Otto & Askov, 1970). Generally, a child is considered to have mastered a skill when his performance on a program-dependent test is at the 80% level or higher.

The materials which have been produced by the Center for the Word Attack and Study Skills elements and which were used in the present field test are:

1. Rationale and Guidelines, an overview of the Design, written for central office personnel, principals, lead teachers, and reading specialists,

2. Teacher's Planning Guide: Word Attack and Teachers's Planning Guide: Study Skills, abridged versions of the Rationale and Guidelines, intended for teachers who will be implementing the Design,

3. Teacher's Resource Files for Word Attack and Study Skills, compilations of references to commercially published instructional materials and teacher-directed activities which have been keyed to the skills,

4. Wisconsin Tests of Reading Skill Development, program-dependent paper-and-pencil tests (either hand or machine scorable) for assessment of skill mastery,

5. Pupil Profile Cards, cards listing skills in Word Attack and Study Skills, with a procedure for recording skill mastery and forming instructional groups.

In all areas of the Design each child's strengths and weaknesses are diagnosed before instruction begins. His individual program is then structured to meet his specific learning needs. The number of children in his instructional group may vary considerably but all lack the specific skill being taught. In regard to skill group instruction, Askov (1971;2) has stated:

> Also implicit in the Design is the recognition that children may learn in different ways. Therefore, a variety of activities and approaches is recommended during the course of instruction for a given group.
>
> As soon as a child gives evidence of having grasped the skill being taught, he is dismissed from skill group instruction to work on another skill need or to engage in independent activities. Thus, skill groups are flexible since frequent changes in composition are made to adjust for the changing needs of individual children.

A more complete description of the recommended use of the Design in an instructional unit appears later.

Previous Product Evaluation

Evaluation of the Design has been incorporated into its development from the beginning. Initially, specifications and objectives for each element and its segments are stated. Each segment then is reviewed and empirically validated in field tryouts. After each tryout, suggested modifications are made. As the materials near their final form, all instructional and assessment segments are pilot tested as a fully integrated instructional system in several elementary schools.

Word Attack. Two schools in predominantly white neighborhoods in small Wisconsin cities participated in the Word Attack pilot test. Mean IQ was 111 for one school and 100 for the other (Kahlmann-Anderson Intelligence Test). To determine whether the behavioral objectives for Word Attack were attained and maintained, program-dependent tests were administered one year apart to children in the second, third, and fourth year of school. The median number of skills which individual students gained in one year was 8 for children in their second year, 19 for third-year children, and 11 for fourth-year children. This performance was judged satisfactory by program developers. For 23 out of 30 skills tested, the percent of children demonstrating mastery was greater for program participants than for non-participants. Results on the Doren Diagnostic Reading Test also favored program participants (from a paper presented by Mary Quilling at the 1970 annual AERA meeting).

Study Skills. Recently compiled information on the pilot tests of the three subareas of Study Skills--maps, graphs and tables, reference--was gathered in three multiunit elementary schools in Wisconsin during 1970-71 and 1971-72. All children in these schools were pretested and placed at their appropriate working levels. Data on the attainment of specific Study Skills, analyzed for one school only, showed that after one year the median working level of children in the primary grades was one level higher than their break-in levels. There seemed to be less progress in the intermediate groups. Analysis of perfor-

mance on a standardized test (Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills) revealed mixed results--some negative and some positive gains. All negative outcomes were associated with substandard implementation of the program.

Field Test Objectives

The Laboratory's field test of the Wisconsin Design in eight Southeast schools takes its place as part of a larger field test, national in scope and comprehensive in nature. After formative evaluation, each element (Word Attack, Study Skills, etc.) undergoes a two-year field test. Since elements were not developed simultaneously, the total field test extends for several years with overlapping implementation (Figure 1).



FIGURE 1. Design field test timeline

The Center views the major purpose of this field test as the determination of whether the Design meets its own program objectives (stated previously) when it is implemented according to recommended procedures. Three secondary objectives concern the Design's relative merit, its cost, and its implemen-

tation in additional "self-selected" schools who expressed an interest in installing the program. For the Wisconsin Center, the specific objectives then are:

1. to determine whether the terminal, interim, and specific objectives of the program are met. (Attainment of terminal and interim objectives is meaningfully assessed only in the second year of program operation and thereafter.)

2. to determine the progress in word attack, study skills, and other reading skills of children with each successive year of experience in the program,

3. to determine the per pupil costs of program implementation including purchase of Design and non-Design materials,

4. to learn how the program is implemented in a variety of selected sites in which leaders are not exposed to a standard training program and how local variants affect program success.

Given the intent of the general field test and the Laboratory's interest in the education of the disadvantaged, the following objectives were established for the Laboratory's field test of the Wisconsin Design:

1. to determine whether the terminal, interim, and specific objectives of the Design are met. (Attainment of terminal and interim objectives is meaningfully assessed only in the second year of program operation and thereafter.)

2. to determine the progress in word attack, study skills, and other reading skills of children with two years of experience in the program,

3. to determine whether orientation of local leaders equips them sufficiently to train their staff and whether local inservice

TABLE 2. Field test objectives for Word Attack and Study Skills, 1970-1972

	1970-71	1971-72
Word Attack	1. to determine whether the specific objectives are met 2. to determine whether the word attack and other reading skills of children using the Design are greater than those not using the Design 3. to determine whether orientation of local leaders equips them sufficiently to train their staff 4. to ascertain how the Design is implemented in a variety of selected sites 5. to determine attitudes toward the Design and its effect on other areas of school program	1. to determine whether the terminal, interim, and specific objectives are met 2. to determine progress in word attack and other reading skills of children with two years' experience in the program
Study Skills		1. to determine whether the specific objectives are met 2. to determine whether the study skills of children using the Design are greater than those not using the Design

training provides essential information for the teacher to use the materials and procedures in the recommended way,

4. to ascertain how the Design is implemented in a variety of selected sites having different geographic locations and different ethnic compositions, and to identify relationships, if any, between successful use of the product and each of the following variants: an urban or rural setting; predominantly white population, predominantly black, or a mixed population (white, black, Spanish speaking, American Indian),

5. to determine the attitudes of staff and others toward the Design and staff opinion as to how experience with the Design affects other areas of the school program.

The first two of these objectives are identical to those of the general field test as planned by the Wisconsin Center and are the two which remained in the Laboratory's second year of work with the Design. Objectives 3, 4, and 5 were evaluated more thoroughly in the first year of implementation than in the second. Table 2 relates these objectives to the Laboratory's two-year field test sequence and to the Word Attack and Study Skills elements.

Target Populations and Site Descriptions

Two general categories of schools participated in the larger national field test. Those in the first category, Type I, had entered into a formal agreement with either the Wisconsin Center or the Southeastern Education Laboratory. Data from these schools served in the evaluation of the Center's Objectives 1, 2, and 3 above. There were 23 Type I schools associated

with the Center and 7 with the Laboratory in 1970-71, 8 in 1971-72. The 100 schools in the second category, Type II, all expressed interest in using the materials on their own and were authorized to do so in return for information used in the evaluation of the Center's Objective 4.

In accordance with the Center's wish to field test the Design in a variety of locales with a variety of student populations, and in accordance with the Laboratory's own stated mission to alleviate educational disadvantage in the Southeast, the field test schools cooperating with the Laboratory were mainly from the disadvantaged segment of the Southeastern school population. All had enough children from low socioeconomic backgrounds to qualify for Title I support, and all had a substantial portion of students achieving below grade level. Collectively, these schools also were to represent the various ethnic groups living in either rural or urban locations (Table 3). In the actual field test, there was no school to represent the rural black population. One school had been chosen in 1970-71 but was subsequently eliminated after a late summer court order reversed the ethnic variants of the student population. The fact that this category remained open was not of great concern since most of the region's black population is in urban areas and the trend is toward an even greater portion being there.

TABLE 3. Design target populations

	Urban	Rural
Predominantly white	School 2	Schools 1 and 5
Predominantly black	Schools 3 and 4	-------
Mixed ethnic groups (black, white, Spanish-speaking, and/or American Indian)	Schools 7 and 8	School 6

Of the eight schools, (listed in Appendix A) all had operated previously with a self-contained classroom organization for instruction. Two, however, had taken initial steps toward nongradedness by beginning to organize large groups of children into instructional units and by installing gradually a more individualized approach to a curriculum area. Six were housed in a traditional one- or two-story rectangular building with separate classrooms. Some of these had been expanded through additions or separate portable units. Two were built to accommodate large groups of children in a cluster or pod arrangement; one of these, however, was still operating on a self-contained basis.

One word of caution about the "typical" nature of the field test schools: there was no attempt to match student populations nor to randomly choose a few schools from the total number in

the three-state area. School administrators (superintendent and principal) were contacted by the Laboratory and introduced to the program generally. Showing interest, they were subsequently invited to serve as a field test school; participation, then, was voluntary.

In the first year of this field test, the target population in these schools was the children in grades 1 through 3 who had not demonstrated mastery of word attack skills through Level D, the final level of the Word Attack element of the Design. In the second year of the field test, work with Word Attack was extended to kindergarten (if the school had one) and grade 4 (some schools also chose to include upper primary groups). Also in 1971-72 implementation of two Study Skills subareas--maps, graphs and tables--began in all grades K-6. (See Table 4 for specific numbers of children involved in the field test.)

TABLE 4. Numbers of children participating in Design field test

School	Grade/Unit						
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6
1 (Units)	---	117	140	140	141	140	
2 (Units)		121	104	119	99	101	122
3	66	85	95	70	94	85	83
4	19	20	19	19	25	21	25
5	---	48	73	60	57	62	63
6	72	80	82	69	68	72	81
7	89	261	272	--	--	--	--
8	---	--	--	238	--	--	--

The exception to this implementation occurred with Schools 7 and 8, two paired schools in a large city. School 7 services grades K-2, while School 8 has K and grades 3-6. Because it received the second graders involved in the 1970-71 field test, School 8 was invited to participate in 1971-72 for continuity in grade 3. Unlike the other schools in the field test, only third graders here were involved.

Evaluation Devices and Methods

A variety of data-gathering and evaluation instruments was employed to achieve the objectives of the field test. Some were developed by the Center, some by the Laboratory, and others by commercial testing companies. These instruments took the form of standardized tests, program-dependent tests, monitoring reports, and informal means. Since the focus of the Laboratory's 1971-72 field test was on the evaluation of Objectives 1 and 2, a description of the devices used previously for the remaining three is omitted here. Any current information on the implementation of the Design (Objective 4) was gathered through personal contact during monitoring visits or orientation meetings.

Objective 1: Word Attack. For the assessment of terminal and interim objectives in the second year of Word Attack implementation, selected children read aloud a list of 74 words. Not every child was presented the same words however. Altogether, five lists were compiled: three of phonically and/or structurally regular words, and two of phonically and/or struc-

turally irregular words. The words were chosen from a list of 50,000 most frequent words in print (Kucera & Francis, 1967). The most unusual and unfamiliar words were not considered; consequently, the total number of words from which the samples of 74 words were randomly compiled was 40,000 to 45,000.

Three categories of word frequency were established. Those of greatest frequency, Frequency 1, were the first 1004 words; the Frequency 2 group consisted of the next 4000 words, with the remaining in the Frequency 3 category. From a sample of the total word population of 40,000 to 45,000 words, the approximate number of regular and irregular words in each frequency was calculated (Table 5). The proportion of regular and irregular

TABLE 5. Approximate number of regular and irregular words in three frequency groups

	Frequency 1	Frequency 2	Frequency 3
Total in frequency group	1004	4000	44,000
Number of regular words	795	2789	27,960
Number of irregular words	209	1211	16,040

words as found in the sample for each frequency was then used in randomly compiling the lists of 74 words for testing. The actual number varies for each frequency and for the irregular

and regular lists (Table 6). No words from Frequency 3 appeared on the irregular lists because of their unusual nature. Dolch words on the regular lists appeared in the Frequency 1 category.

TABLE 6. Number of words in each frequency on two types of word lists

	Frequency 1	Frequency 2	Frequency 3
Regular lists	20	26	28
Irregular lists	29	45	--

The relative number of words by frequency in the samples of 74 words only partly reflects the corresponding relative proportions in the total populations for two reasons. One was the practical consideration of list length. Accurate estimates of a child's performance on the total list were desired, yet reading a list of more than 75 words seemed an unfair task for a third or fourth grader, especially those who had not attained all of the Word Attack skills. However, reasonably good estimates of performance for each frequency were necessary. This meant the random selection of at least 20 or more words from each frequency group. Consequently, the relative proportion was only one factor influencing the exact number of words

chosen from each frequency.

Of the total population of children involved in the Word Attack program, 281 had checked out of Level D by May 1, 1972. From these, 150 were chosen at random to be tested with the word lists. The exact number tested at any one school depended on the total number of checkouts reported by that school. Approximately 75 of the 150 read a regular list; the other read an irregular list. An additional 150 children were chosen randomly from the population of noncheckouts, i.e., children who had not completed Level D by May 1. These children also read both regular and irregular word lists.

During May the Field Test Coordinator tested the 300 children, using directions and procedures standardized for all testers employed by both the Wisconsin Center and the Laboratory. Children were presented a stack of cards, with one word on each card. They were to turn the cards over one at a time and read each word aloud. All were encouraged to try each word, even if it were unfamiliar. No time limit was set. The amount of time required for each child varied according to his skill level but ranged from about 5 minutes for the checkouts to 20 or 25 minutes for the noncheckouts. If the words proved too difficult for a child (2 correct out of 25, or 8 of 50), testing was terminated.

Data for the evaluation of attainment of <u>specific objectives</u> were gathered in three ways: (1) administering a sample of paper-and-pencil program-dependent tests to randomly

selected groups (N=25) in grades 1, 2, 3, and 4, (2) recording each individual's skill mastery progress, and (3) recording for each skill group the number of children mastering that skill. The group tests (Appendix B) were administered by teachers in May of each year of the field test. The dependent variable was the number of correct responses. From this the percent of students who performed at the 80% level or higher was determined. In 1971-72 Design coordinators at each school were provided with a form for recording the number of skills attained by each child at three times during the year--September, January, and May (Appendix C). From these records a profile of individual performances emerged. Also, the number of children who could demonstrate mastery of a skill after a two- or three-week period varied considerably. To learn the average percent of mastery, a record was kept from January 1972 to May for the skill groups taught by each teacher (Appendix D).

Objective 1: Study Skills. As an initial step toward evaluation of Objective 1 for Study Skills, a sample of program-dependent tests from the complete battery was administered to randomly chosen groups in grades 3-6 in November 1971 (Appendix B). Selected sections of the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills were also included. The children's attainment of specific Study Skills objectives will be measured by a comparison of these scores with those to be obtained in November 1972.

Objective 2. This objective concerns the relative quality of performance of children from one year to another, from

no experience with the Design to two years' experience. For the second and final year of field test for Word Attack three scores were compared for each grade on each skill test (the same tests used for Objective 1): the baseline score of 1970, the score after one year of implementation in 1971, and another after two years in 1972. For Study Skills only the baseline score is presently available, from tests given in November 1971. These scores will be compared by the Center with those of November 1972. For Word Attack and Study Skills selected standardized subtests relating to these areas of reading were also administered (see Appendix B for specific tests).

Conditions for Implementation

Word Attack. Some of the requisites for implementation in the first year related to initial activities and were not of concern in the second year. The following conditions were considered by the Wisconsin Center to be requisite to on-going implementation (Quilling, 1971a).

1. The addition of at least one age/grade level annually after the first year to provide continuity for a given age group for at least two or three years.

2. A minimum of one-quarter day at the beginning of the year to acquaint staff with new information and materials related to the program, to evaluate the previous year's progress and set goals, and to key new materials.

3. An additional one-day directed inservice meeting (could be spread over one quarter) to orient teachers new to the building and those using the program for the first time.

4. Availability of materials as follows:

   Rationale and Guidelines--1 per building
   Teacher's Guide--1 per teacher
   Addendum to the Teacher's Planning Guide--1 per teacher
   Teacher's Resource Files--1 per unit or 1 for every 4 teachers
   Wisconsin Tests for Reading Skill Development
      machine scorable--1 package for each 35 children
      subtest format--1 set of ditto masters for Form 1
   Pupil profile cards--1 per pupil

5. Initial booklet testing in grade 1 and of new enrollees within the first month of school.

6. Retesting within four weeks (a) at a higher level for pupils who mastered all or all but one skill on the level first tested, or (b) at a lower level for pupils who mastered either none or one skill at the level first tested.

7. Pretesting at the next instructional level as the pupil completed skills at a lower level.

8. Provision of at least two hours per week for skill instruction.

9. Skill grouping for a period of no more than three weeks.

10. Assessment upon completion of instruction.

11. Current record-keeping.

12. Monitoring of each child's skill development by a designated teacher.

Study Skills. Since this was the first year of implementation for Study Skills, the requisites were slightly different from those of Word Attack (Quilling, 1971b):

1. Attendance of at least one local leader at a training conference sponsored by the developer.

2. Total staff involvement at all age/grade levels and at least a two-year operational sequence.

3. Directed inservice and work sessions. Inservice sessions were necessary to train personnel; for those experienced with Word Attack one day of inservice sufficed. Intermediate teachers who had not previously used the Design required at least one additional day of orientation, as did new teachers.

4. A variety of materials keyed to the behavioral objectives. A wide variety of instructional materials were to be available for teaching skills at all levels so that the program would have the flexibility to respond to a wide variety of individual needs and characteristics.

5. Availability of materials as follows:

   Teacher's Planning Guide--1 per teacher
   Teacher's Resource Files--1 per unit or 1 for every 4 teachers
   Wisconsin Tests of Reading Skill Development
      machine scorable--1 for each child plus 20% more
      single-sheet format--complete set of ditto masters
   Pupil profile cards--1 per child

6. Initial booklet testing in grades 2-6 at the beginning of the program.

7. Retesting within four weeks at a higher or lower level for those who mastered (1) all or all but one skill, (2) none or one skill at the level first tested.

8. Testing of newly enrolled students within one month after entering school.

9. At least two hours per week for skill instruction.

10. Skill grouping for a period of no more than three weeks.

11. Assessment upon completion of instruction.

12. Current record-keeping.

13. Monitoring of each child's skill development by a designated teacher.

The assurance that most of these conditions of implementation would be met by each school was achieved through rather detailed letters of agreement between the schools and the Laboratory (Appendix E). These agreements provided for the Laboratory's sponsoring an orientation conference for Study Skills, providing one-half of the cost of classroom instructional materials necessary for effective implementation of Study Skills, and furnishing staff support for consultation during monitoring visits. In addition, the Wisconsin Center furnished all of the Design's teacher materials and one-half of the student materials for all schools. Meeting other conditions of implementation was the responsibility of the schools.

WORD ATTACK

The first element of the Wisconsin Design was ready for field test and summative evaluation by spring of 1970. At that time a cooperative relationship was established between the Wisconsin Center and the Laboratory, and seven schools in the Southeast agreed to participate in the two-year field test.

Review: First Year of Field Test and Results

To prepare schools for implementation of the Design, the Laboratory conducted two conferences during summer 1970. One was a three-day workshop in July, attended by at least one representative from each participating school. Its outcome was the coding of classroom materials to Design skills for addi-

tion to the Teacher's Resource File. This was considered a necessary procedure since the textbooks and materials mainly used in the participating schools were not included in the commercial version of the Resource File. The second conference in August concerned the orientation of three representatives of the school systems: the principal, a lead teacher, and a reading specialist. Staff from the Wisconsin Center and the Laboratory cooperated in the two-day training session, designed to equip local leaders with sufficient information to train their teachers and aides. All local inservice sessions were attended by a Laboratory representative in the dual roles of monitor and consultant.

During September and early October schools administered the break-in tests to all children in grades 1-3. Any necessary retesting was completed by the end of October. Sometime in November the first skill groups were formed. The three weeks' period initially planned for skill instruction was later shortened to two weeks. Five of the original seven schools chose to form skill groups across grade lines; one grouped within each grade; and one chose to remain with the self-contained classroom situation. Anywhere from 1/8 to 1/4 of the total reading time was spent in word word attack skill instruction (Johnson, 1971b).

Implementation in each school was closely monitored throughout the year. At least three visits were made to out-of-state

schools and more to those in the Atlanta area. During each visit specific questions were asked of Design coordinators, and teachers were consulted either individually or in groups as to the progress of the program from their point of view.

All schools successfully carried out the conditions of implementation as stated previously. The main problem experienced at all levels was the lack of planning for children who mastered a skill before the two- or three-week interval was ended. These children ideally would experience guided independent study activities, either in a media center, a library, or their classroom. Concentration on other aspects of the program in the first year did not allow time to prepare adequately for the early skill masters. This was not a problem, however, in the second year.

The children's performance on program-dependent tests at the end of the first year indicated that approximately 81% of the children who had mastered the tested skills during the year retained them and were able to demonstrate subsequent mastery. The average percentages by grade were: grade 1, 79%; grade 2, 85%; grade 3, 80%. Gains on the program-dependent tests from 1970 to 1971 were positive in all three grades, though not large enough to reach statistical significance. The range of gain scores was from a minimal .30 on a Level C skill in grade 3 to 4.5 on a Level B skill in grade 2.

Subsections of standardized tests were also administered to children in grades 2 and 3. On the Word Analysis section of the Cooperative Primary Test second graders showed a gain

in raw score of 4.32; third grades, 4.47. Third graders also responded to two subsections of the Stanford Achievement Test, showing a gain of slightly more than one point on the Word Meaning and Word Study Skills tests.

Description of Second Year of Implementation

Few changes if any were made by schools in their second year of work with Word Attack. Because break-in testing for every child was unnecessary, skill groups began much sooner than last year, none later than the first part of October. Complete booklet testing was carried out only with entering first graders and new enrollees. Others who had been in the program for one year continued on the level at which they had been operating when school recessed.

The major change in Word Attack implementation was the introduction of pretesting strategy to be used when children had completed the skills on one level and were ready to progress to the next higher level. Experience and data from 1970-71 showed that children were likely to learn some skills at the next level without being introduced to them in formal skill group instruction. Since this incidental learning would not be shown on the profile cards, it was considered wise to pretest children, using selected tests from the next level. All schools were encouraged to carry out this strategy and many followed through. Others chose not to because of lack of personnel or time.

Arrangements for independent study for a child who mastered a skill before others in his group were better organized than in the first year of implementation. Many schools spent time during the summer planning study activities and arranging materials in a work area. More use was made of librarians, media people, and aides in supervising independent study.

Organization for instruction continued in much the same fashion as during the previous year with the exception of Schools 1 and 2. During the 1970-71 school year and summer these schools effected an organizational change from grouping by grade or classroom to a unitized arrangement. Children in a single unit were within a two- or three-year age span and were functioning more or less on the same instructional level. Word Attack skill groups then were formed within each unit, which included anywhere from 100 to 140 children.

The first graders in School 1 receive instruction in i.t.a., transiding to traditional orthography by the end of grade 1 or beginning of grade 2. Toward the end of 1970-71 Design tests were given to those children who had made the transition. Generally they entered the program on Level B. In 1971-72 it was decided to delay entry into the Design until the beginning of a child's second year. Although no first graders were officially in the program, they were given the Wisconsin Tests each year along with the rest of the school. Their scores, however, were analyzed separately and were not included in the grade 1 analysis for all schools.

In the second year of implementation the third grade of School 8 was added to the field test. In a paired situation this school received the third graders who had been in the program in School 7 the previous year. Teachers received the same kind of orientation as others in the field test. As in other schools, a Design coordinator was responsible for overseeing implementation, keeping records, and so on.

Evaluation

A complete evaluation of the second-year field test for Word Attack was not possible at the time of report publication. Data which have not been analyzed to date will be reported in a supplement as soon as printouts arrive and analysis is complete. For Study Skills no conclusions on pupil progress can be made on the basis of substantive data until evaluation tests are given in November 1972. For the record and for the participating schools' information, however, baseline scores obtained from November 1971 testing are presented in Appendix F.

Objective 1: Word Attack. To determine whether the terminal interim, and specific objectives of the Design are met.

Evaluation of the childrens' attainment of the terminal and interim objectives of Word Attack cannot be done at this point since an analysis of their performance on reading the word lists has not been completed. As stated previously, three data-gathering instruments were used to assess children's attainment of specific objectives: (1) program-dependent tests

given in May 1972, (2) a growth record for each individual (Appendix C), and (3) a record of skill group progress for each teacher (Appendix D). A report of information from the first of these, the Design tests, will be included in the evaluation supplement to be completed later. Information from the other two, however, has been compiled and will be summarized here.

Many people involved in the first-year field test felt that a certain amount of information was neglected when individual scores were grouped across schools to get a grand mean. Also, some indicated that they were interested in knowing the progress of individuals in the mastery of Word Attack skills. In an attempt to collect this kind of information teachers were asked to keep a record of the number of skills mastered by all children in a grade or unit. Three times during the year either the teacher of WDRSD coordinator was to review each child's profile card and record the number of skills mastered to date--September, January, and May. This information was compiled, omitting children whose records were incomplete (withdrawals, new enrollees, missing information, and so on).

Results indicated that in all grades the majority of children mastered between 5 and 12 skills although the range was from 1 to 29 (Table 7). The average child in any grade attained at least 5 skills though he was most likely to master more, possibly as many as 20 or 25 and, as in a few exceptional cases,

TABLE 7. Average number of Word Attack skills mastered by each grade/unit

	Grade/unit 1			Grade/unit 2			Grade/unit 3			Grade/unit 4			Grade/unit 5		
	N	$\bar{X}$	range	N	$\bar{X}$	range	N	$\bar{X}$	range	N	$\bar{X}$	range	N	$\bar{X}$	range
School 1	43	12.1	5-18	66	9.4	2-16	39	6.6	3-11	47	6.8	3-10			
School 2	112	7.3	3-13	129	11.4	2-26	123	9.7	2-18	118	12.1	1-29	111	8.7	1-26
School 3	71	8.3	1-15	91	5.3	1-21	48	8.2	1-17	57	11.0	1-26			
School 5	51	5.3	1-9	69	5.2	1-10	57	6.2	2-9	58	5.6	2-9	62	4.4	2-10
School 6	75	9.6	2-14	51	9.2	1-18	41	19.2	7-25	42	8.7	1-23			
School 7	260	8.1	1-19	216	10.3	2-22									
School 8							255	7.3	1-22						

Note: Information from School 4 is unavailable.

more than 25. In all grades between 1/3 and 2/3 of the children learned 6 to 10 skills during the year (Table 8). The number of children who progressed at a faster rate than their classmates and mastered 16 or more skills varied considerably from school to school. In a few grades this was no more than 2% while in others the number was as high as 25% or 30%.

In some schools children in grades 1 and 2 seemed to master a greater number of skills than those in grades 3 and 4. In other schools the situation was reversed. One must remember that at the upper levels, grades 4 and 5, the actual number of skills mastered will be limited by the child's completing Level D and checking out of the Word Attack program entirely.

Teachers or the WDRSD coordinator also kept a record of skill groups, recording the number in each group, the period of instruction, and the number of children demonstrating mastery of the skill at the end of the period (usually two weeks). A complete set of information was available for 80 teachers, who taught anywhere from 4 to 20 skill groups during the year. The size of skill groups varied from 1 to 39 though the number of groups at either end of this range was small. Average group size in all but one school was around 25. The exception to this was School 2 with an average group size of 10. This school also showed the highest number of children checking out of a skill at the end of instruction, an average of 82%. As

TABLE 8. Number of children mastering Word Attack skills

	Number of skills					Total
	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	above 20	N
School 1						
Unit 1	1	17	16	9		43
Unit 2	12	29	21	4		66
Unit 3	10	28	1			39
Unit 4	15	32				47
School 2						
Unit 1	27	70	15			112
Unit 2	10	60	30	14	15	129
Unit 3	15	51	51	6		123
Unit 4	18	35	35	19	11	118
Unit 5	37	40	16	12	6	111
School 3						
Grade 1	21	22	28			71
Grade 2	60	24	5	1	1	91
Grade 3	16	15	15	2		48
Grade 4	20	9	11	8	9	57
School 5						
Grade 1	29	22				51
Grade 2	36	33				69
Grade 3	21	36				57
Grade 4	23	35				58
School 6						
Grade 1	5	41	29			75
Grade 2	9	21	20	1		51
Grade 3		3	4	13	21	41
Grade 4	16	8	12	5	1	42
School 7						
Grade 1	67	134	47	12		260
Grade 2	32	86	73	22	3	216
School 8						
Grade 3	100	103	43	6	3	255

Note: Data include only those children for whom a complete year's record could be obtained. Information from School 4 is unavailable.

would be expected, teacher performance as measured by percent of checkouts, varied as much as student performance. One teacher who generally had about 33 children in her skill groups averaged only 11% checkout throughout the year, while others with the same group size averaged 40% to 50% success. In general those teachers who were able to work with fewer children showed a more satisfactory rate of checkout, some as high as 90% to 95%.

Objective 2: Word Attack. To determine the progress in word attack and other reading skills of children with two years' of experience in the program.

Date for this objective were obtained from evaluation tests administered each year in May (Appendix B). Scores from 1970 were considered baseline data, representing the performance of children with no experience in the Word Attack program; 1971 scores are from children in the same grades, having participated in the program for one year; 1972 scores represent two years' of experience for grades 2, 3, and 4 and again one year for grade 1. For each test sitting a group of approximately 25 children were randomly chosen from class lists. Average scores for groups tested in each school (presented in Appendix F) were combined for each grade across schools. Because individual tests contained a varying number of items, grade means were converted to percent for comparison purposes (Figures 2, 3, and 4).

In grade 1 all 1972 scores on Design tests were higher

than the 1970 baseline scores (Figure 2) except that for consonant blends (B5). The mean on this test dropped in 1971 and was just slightly higher in 1972. On two other tests, although the 1972 scores were still above baseline, they dropped some from those of 1971. These were rhyming words (A1) and rhyming phrases (A5). Review of individual school means indicates that all schools except one showed a decrease on these two tests from 1971 to 1972. On six of the nine skills tested, however, scores were progressively higher with each year of Word Attack implementation. Exceptional progress occurred in one school whose first graders in 1972 gained an average of 4 points over first graders in 1971, and on one test as many as 10 points.



FIGURE 2. Mean scores converted to percent correct on Design tests in grade 1

In grade 2 the combined mean of five of the nine tested skills was higher in 1972 than in 1970 or 1971 (Figure 3). On two other skills the children's performance dropped in the second year but not below the baseline score. On the two remaining tests the 1972 and baseline scores were nearly identical. Again, reporting an average score obscures the above average performance of one school in which second graders showed a gain on every Design test, in one case a five point gain for a test on which all others either went down or remained the same.



FIGURE 3. Mean scores converted to percent correct on Design tests in grade 2

Less gain was shown by grade 3 in the second year than by the other two grades (Figure 4). On four skills there was some gain over the 1971 average, but only one of these was above the

baseline score. Others either remained the same or decreased. Here again one school showed an increase on every skill while increases for other schools were erratic and showed no pattern.



FIGURE 4. Mean scores converted to percent correct on Design tests in grade 3

This was the first year for Word Attack implementation in grade 4. Consequently, 1971 scores constitute the baseline data for this grade. The children, however, had been in the program in third grade in 1971 and completed their second year with the program in 1972. All of the combined means were higher at the end of this year though one increase was very slight (Figure 5). One school which had much lower baseline scores than others showed rather remarkable improvement over the year, the greatest gain being nine points.



FIGURE 5. Mean scores converted to percent correct on Design tests in grade 4

Little improvement was shown during the second year on the subsections of standardized tests (Table 9). Scores of 1971 showed a one or two point increase over baseline scores, but in 1972 some averages decreased while most remained about the same.

In general more increases over the two-year period occurred in grades 1 and 2 than in grade 3. Only in grade 4 were increases consistent. There seems to be no pattern to explain the decreases or lack of increase in grades 1-3. Means for each school (Appendix F) indicate that in each grade one or two schools showed a relatively outstanding performance, but the particular schools for each grade are not identical. One school may show an above average gain for grade 1, but another for grade 2, and so on. Again in 1972 as in 1971 gains in grade 3 were minimal. The exceptions to this occurred on one or two tests from one school. An explanation for this is difficult to find since there is room for improvement. Perhaps word attack skills are not

TABLE 9. Means on standardized tests in grades 2, 3, and 4

	Grade 2	Grade 3			Grade 4	
	Cooperative Primary Test	Cooperative Primary Test	Stanford Achievement Test		Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills	
	Word Analysis	Word Analysis	Word Meaning	Word Study Skills	Vocabulary	Comprehension
1972	38.32	44.80	17.51	34.09	23.45	27.33
1971	42.69	44.69	18.33	34.24	23.44	28.27
1970	40.46	43.18	17.01	32.39	---	---

emphasized as much in third grade as in the lower grades. Perhaps at this time skills in other areas take precedent in terms of time, review, and so on.

STUDY SKILLS

The second element of the Wisconsin Design to be field tested was Study Skills. The map and graph and table subareas were ready for fall 1972. All seven of the Laboratory's original Word Attack field test schools, grades K-6, were also included in the Study Skills field test. The eighth school, added in 1971-72 for Word Attack, did not participate in the Study Skills program.

The first-year field test of Study Skills was planned to begin in November 1971. In late October a one-day conference was held in Atlanta, attended by at least one person from each participating school. School personnel were introduced to the Study Skills materials and briefed on target dates for implementation of the program. In early November teachers administered the evaluation-related tests in grades 3-6 (Appendix B). These tests were to be used in assessing pupils' progress one year later by comparison with scores from November 1972 (Objective 2). In late November and early December break-in tests were given in grades 2-6 to determine the level at which each child would be working (Table 10). It was assumed that first graders would be on Level A, which has no paper-and-pencil test. The test levels for grades 2-5 were fixed by the Wisconsin Center

for test data purposes. In other grades the teachers chose what they considered to be the appropriate level.

TABLE 10. Break-in testing levels for each grade: Study Skills

Grade	Test level
2	B
3	B or C
4	B or C
5	C
6	C or D

Skill groups were to begin in January but this did not happen in any school. Scores from the break-in tests indicated that a large number of children had been tested at an inappropriate level (sometimes too high but most often too low) and much retesting had to be done before children could be accurately assigned to skill groups (Table 11). Return of scores and retesting took several weeks, and skill grouping actually began in most schools in late February or early March. One school, however, experienced a few more problems than usual and delayed implementation until September 1972.

Since Study Skills relate very closely to content areas such as math, science, and social studies, the matter of integrating these skills into the existing curricula posed a problem not solved satisfactorily in the first months of implementation.

There were two alternative ways of doing this: (1) to let the content suggest what study skills are to be learned, or (2) to teach skills in isolation and then relate them to whatever content is being studied. The first method seems to require much advance planning and complete familiarity with the skills and instructional materials. The second is more like what had been done in Word Attack. Without exception, the schools chose, for this year, to form separate skill groups and to relate the skills as much as possible to activities in content areas. Study skills were taught in "isolation" with application to other activities, for the most part, left to chance.

TABLE 11. Average percent of children retested in each grade

	Grade 2 (%)	Grade 3 (%)	Grade 4 (%)	Grade 5 (%)	Grade 6 (%)
Next higher level	21	44	26	34	41
Next lower level	41	13	38	37	38
Total retested	62	57	64	71	79

Evaluation of objectives 1 and 2 is not possible at this time since only the baseline data have been gathered. Scores from tests given in November 1971 will be compared by the Cen-

ter with those which will be given in November 1972. However, the 1971 means for each school are presented in Appendix F for the use of participating schools and others who may be interested.

DISCUSSION

In the second and final year of the Word Attack field test children showed progressive increases on the evaluation tests for some skills and slight decreases on others. Performance in grades 1-3 was erratic, showing no pattern of increase or decrease. In grade 4 all scores increased in 1972 over the baseline scores of 1971. Although some children mastered only a few skills during the year, in some cases the number of skills mastered by individual students was remarkable. Other encouraging results occurred in specific grades in specific schools where increases on most tests were much greater than the average increase across schools.

In general, except for grade 4, there seemed to be a slowdown during this second year of implementation. Several schools experienced noncurricular problems unique to their situation. The accumulation of these could have produced a "marking time" effect on the data. Two schools were experiencing their first year with a unitized organization. In previous years they had been working toward the nongraded situation which was fully realized in fall 1972. Consequently, one or more new programs in other content areas were implemented simultaneously with the second year of Word Attack, and faculty experienced the range

of problems accompanying a new organizational pattern and instructional procedures. In one school several teachers participated in a professional training program for one semester. A series of relief teachers assumed the responsibilities of the absent ones. They were not thoroughly familiar with the Design and may not have been comfortable in following recommended procedures. In other schools there were changes in administration and Design coordination. All of these factors may have influenced the Word Attack data.

Implementation of Study Skills was delayed this year because of late return of scores and the great amount of retesting necessary before students could be placed at their appropriate levels. Since actual skill groups did not meet until March in most schools, teachers had only two full months at the most before being caught up in end-of-the year activities. Many schools, however, made much progress in gathering materials for classroom use and in adding new references to the Resource Files.

Some difficulty occurred in first grade where many children seemed to be between levels. They easily mastered the skills on Level A yet could not handle any of those on Level B. Teachers faced with this situation omitted the teaching of study skills altogether and concentrated more on Word Attack and other areas. There was also the problem of scheduling Study Skill groups at a point more than midway through the school year. Instructional and planning schedules were already filled to capacity, and the addition of a new element caused a strain for everyone.

In the fall of 1972, teachers will be more familiar with the Study Skills objectives and will be able to plan for skill groups from the beginning of the year. Unitized schools will be entering their second year with more experience and confidence. And all schools will continue to improve their implementation of a program which they believe works.

III

AESTHETIC EDUCATION PROGRAM

The Southeastern Education Laboratory conducted an extensive search in the spring of 1970 for promising educational products and/or instructional strategies for implementation in the schools of the region. It was intended that these products would be utilized by the schools which had particular needs in their current instructional programs. As a result of the search for innovative products, SEL selected CEMREL'S (formerly the Central Midwestern Regional Educational Laboratory, Inc.) Aesthetic Education Program as a product that had great promise for the schools. Because the materials had been evaluated only in the St. Louis, Missouri area, CEMREL desired that the materials be tested with more diversified populations throughout the country and without intervention by the product developer.

This section of the report describes the Aesthetic Education Program, the field trial activities, the test sites and target population as well as teacher and pupil reactions to the materials.

AESTHETIC EDUCATION: AN INTRODUCTION

During the past several decades, technology and technique have contributed to a media and knowledge explosion. Bizarre images, sounds, and actions generated at incomprehensible speeds compete for our attention and often prevent sound judgment and aesthetic discrimination. The Report of the President's

Commission on National Goals expressed a concern for the extent to which contemporary patterns of life are being conditioned by appeals and pressures of which people are scarcely conscious (Heckscher, 1960). The need to examine these conditioned responses is a persuasive argument for the clarification of an active role for the arts and the artist.

The arts can provide insight into the aesthetic sensitivity and capabilities of a society, and they can give it direction. They can help to lead new generations into patterns of belief, thereby establishing continuity between the past and the present. By bringing the actions of people into concert, the arts also contribute to the stability of society, and by challenging the status quo, they provide opportunity for improvement. But more important, the arts help to shape the creativity, the imagination, the taste, and the values of society by engaging individuals in aesthetic experiences. Although these experiences are often difficult to interpret, no one denies that they have been and can be a means of making order out of a confusing and perplexing world.

Unfortunately, one of the difficulties in the Twentieth Century is that the arts have been viewed as highly specialized and somewhat precious outcomes of an intelligence insulated from the affairs of men. Such interpretation is alternative to the view that the arts are the symbolic expressions of what individuals in a society feel, think, know, will, and prize. When the arts are regarded as self-contained entities isolated from

the concerns of on-going life, human experience is denied its meaning and consequently becomes limited. As a result, the arts tend to be reduced to objects and events that are "studied" in order for the user to become "educated." Because of this, broad powers of aesthetic discrimination are hard to come by, if available at all.

Even though genuine aesthetic experiences and judgments are important for society and its individuals, there still remains the question of how to provide for them. There are those who feel that aesthetic experience is derived from a quality engagement between a person and some object or event and therefore cannot be taught. It can only be experienced. However, the potential meaning in aesthetic experience depends upon an individual's ability to discriminate those qualities of media, structure, and content form which meanings are created. Society needs not only the production and distribution of knowledge but also the active search for cultivation of sensitive and competent judgments. Given these points of view, an important educational task must be to enhance the ability to discriminate, interpret, and evaluate. The social institution best able to accomplish this is the school.

The charge which aesthetic education places on general education is becoming increasingly clear. The schools must systematically help to develop individuals who, through sensitive judgment, criticism, evaluation, and manipulation, and who, provided with alternatives and informed aesthetic sensitivities,

will take part in shaping the aesthetic and cultural climate of our society (Champlin, 1968). Because the development of such individuals will have social consequences, and because our society aspires to be democratic, aesthetic education should reach the greatest number of individuals.

CEMREL'S Aesthetic Education Program is not the only solution nor the ultimate solution, but it is an early step in strengthening instruction in the arts.

PRODUCT DESCRIPTION

In 1967, CEMREL initiated plans for the Aesthetic Education Program, a long range curriculum development effort to provide a general education in aesthetics for all elementary and secondary students. Instructional packages were to be developed in two components, K-6 series and 7-12 series, each teaching a set of related concepts. Presently, all development efforts are directed toward the K-6 series and some of these packages have completed extended pilot testing. Packages in the 7-12 series are in the planning stage.

Goals and Outcomes

CEMREL'S Aesthetic Education Program was founded upon two major premises. The first was the belief that the school could and should cultivate the sensitivities and capabilities for aesthetic judgment within the student and, further, that with this end in mind, it is possible to design educational programs

for this purpose. The Program developers agree with Read's (1966;144) statement that:

> Education should be integral. It should encourage the growth of the whole and complete individual.
>
> It follows that education is not entirely, nor even mainly, an affair of book learning, for that is only the education of one part of our nature--the part of the mind that deals with concepts and abstractions. In the child, who is not yet mature enough to think by these short-cut methods, it should be largely an education of the senses--the senses of sight, touch and hearing: in one word, the education of the sensibility.

The Program's second premise was a conception of the nature of the aesthetic experience. Just what comprises an aesthetic experience has been debated through the centuries. Some philosophers have argued that because one cannot predict the character of new forms in the arts or new phenomena in life and the environment, the "true" nature of the aesthetic object and the aesthetic encounter cannot be resolved. Weitz (1965;29) in his discussion of "What is the nature of art?" states that "art, as the logic of concept shows, has no set of necessary and sufficient properties, hence a theory of it is logically impossible and not merely factually difficult." Although there is no general agreement upon the definition of aesthetic experience (in terms of its necessary and sufficient properties), there is a widespread view that aesthetic experience is experience which is valued intrinsically, that is, valued for itself. In such an experience one perceives the interrelationships between the form and the content of the experience. Such perception makes

aesthetic experience different from other extrinsically valued experiences in every day life. Experiences of any other kind, however valuable, are extra-aesthetic.

From these basic premises it follows that the general goal for aesthetic education must be the enhancement of students' capacities to experience the aesthetic qualities (values) in both man-made and natural phenomena and to make informed aesthetic judgments.

A student having participated fully in a program of aesthetic education would be able to perceive, analyze, judge, and value man-made and natural phenomena with knowledge that aesthetic criteria exist and may be applied to these experiences. This student would, when confronted by an object or event, be able to react by talking about the phenomena in a way which displays a knowledge of aesthetic values. He would have engaged in activities involved in the production or performance of objects or events which may lead to aesthetic experiences. These objectives imply that for the student, the outcome of the program would be personal responsibility for his aesthetic decisions--responsibility for the choices he makes relative to his life style and responsibility regarding what he prizes or rejects as a person in our society. Therefore, the Program's outcome for the student is not to train him as architect, painter, writer, or filmmaker, but to heighten, within him those vital sensitivities which may enable him to make judgments on the basis of relevant aesthetic criteria.

Specifically, for the student the Aesthetic Education Program intends:

1. to extend the aesthetic in personal and social life through demonstrating how aesthetic considerations enter into various arts and art forms, into individual works of art, and into the general environment;

2. through juxtaposing or relating the several arts in units of instruction to lead students to discover similarities and differences among the arts--by these means, to enhance the students' responses to aesthetic qualities particular to each of the arts and to demonstrate that all the arts are potential sources of aesthetic experience;

3. to involve the student in various models of behavior which are aesthetic in nature, such as the creative or critical processes;

4. to introduce the student to a wide range of views about aesthetic qualities so that he develops his own criteria and ability for making aesthetic judgments;

5. to facilitate the acceptance of aesthetic values as important to the individual and the society; and

6. to make aesthetic values relevant to the environment in which the student lives (Basic Program Plan, 1972)

A question may arise, What are the implications for the community of involving its students in the Aesthetic Education Program? The effects on the community of such a program, confined as it is to the schools, will not be immediately evident. However, in addition to the influence which students exposed to this program might ultimately have on the community, the developers anticipate making a more direct effort to influence the community's values by extending the current program into

the community itself.

Each community has a cultural resource, however meager. The Program developers intend to utilize this resource in the following ways:

1. by developing, from materials designed for school use, subsets which are applicable to use in the home;

2. by developing models by which the school and agencies within the community can relate to one another for development of a total aesthetic education program;

3. by designing ways that the human resources--professionals outside the school--can be used to further the Aesthetic Education Program goals;

4. by developing methods for making better use of existing community resources, such as museums and performing groups and for relating these to the overall goals of the Aesthetic Education Program;

5. by effecting methods for introducing community concerns of an aesthetic nature into the school's curriculum with educational materials; and

6. by using the public media, such as television, as an alternate but related thrust of the program into the school.

The six goals imply that CEMREL will (1) develop instructional packages, creating a flexible instructional system for the elementary and secondary schools; (2) design the materials in such a way that they can be adapted and arranged within a wide range of educational settings and value systems operating within our schools; (3) without sacrificing the quality or content of the materials, utilize, whenever applicable, educational technology and media in package construction; (4) provide

a new area of study for the total educational program organized for the teacher and student and applicable to all students rather than a specialized few; (5) introduce not only quality substantive materials but package materials which are catalysts for learning experiences and finally, (6) complement and, wherever possible, make use of, rather than replace, current instruction in the arts.

Field Trial Materials

The program staff is developing a K-6 and a 7-12 series of instructional packages. A broad range of multimedia materials provides for maximum individualized learning. Six hundred to 700 hours of instruction, divided into approximately 40 packages are projected for grades K-6. Building on the conceptual base developed in previous packages, 600 hours of instruction, or 30 to 40 packages, are planned for grades 7-12. Thus a projected total of 1200 hours of curriculum material will be available to a school system which uses the Aesthetic Education Program in its entirety.

Currently, there are four groups of instructional packages in the K-6 series. Each group is planned to complement rather than replace present instruction in the arts and in general education and can be effectively handled by the classroom teacher and the arts specialist alike.

The first group of packages, called Aesthetics in the Physical World, provides for investigating the aesthetic qualities

of time, space, motion, sound and light. These elements transcend the arts disciplines and thus provide a means for unifying studies of the arts into aesthetic education. Exemplars from all the arts disciplines form the content, and a basic premise in each of the packages is that all phenomena may have aesthetic qualities, whether they be man-made or natural.

The second group, Aesthetics and Arts Elements, encompasses concepts that relate specifically to the elements applied in the arts and the environment. Packages such as Aural Texture, Tension, Meter, and Texture: Visual/Tactile appear in this group. The emphasis is on recognition of the elements within an arts discipline and its relationship to the structure of the whole work, the aesthetic phenomenon. Although the student is engaged in some activities in which he transforms elements into an art form, the emphasis is placed more on perceiving and describing the structure of the creative process in order to begin development of the critical and descriptive skill necessary to making aesthetic judgments.

The third group of packages, Aesthetics and the Creative Process, presents the process of transforming the elements into whole works of art. The student is attending to methods by which he creates his own structure and in doing so creates works of art. Thus, he enters into the process of making aesthetic judgments. Inherent in this process is the formulation of a basis for aesthetic judgments by the students. This group includes

Constructing Dramatic Plot, Creating Work Pictures, Relating Sound and Movement, and Creating Characterization.

The fourth group, Aesthetics and the Artist, emphasizes how professionals in the arts organize arts elements to form a complete work. This group includes packages such as The Composer and The Choreographer. The continuity in this series is based on the role similarities that all artists share within the creative process: each originates an idea and organizes elements into an end product that communicates. Several patterns begin to emerge in packages in this group. Although artists may work in different disciplines, utilizing different materials and methodologies, the structures of their works and the process of transformation exhibit similarities. It is this fourth group that represents an important cross pollination. Through the artist's role, the students experience and implement concepts and skills acquired in the other groups of packages.

The aesthetic qualities of all the arts, rather than discrete instruction in one or several arts areas, are the focus of all materials. Arts areas are juxtaposed in some of the packages pointing out differences as well as similarities. A range of art forms, styles, and periods is presented in the packages, e.g. the musical selections in Meter range from Beethoven to the Fifth Dimension. But the content is not limited to the arts: aesthetic aspects of the environment, technology, and nature are also presented, discussed, and evaluated in packages such

as Texture: Visual/Tactile, and Aural Texture. And, of special importance, points of view about aesthetic qualities in objects and events, about the creative process itself, and about critical responses, are given honest exploration, particularly in packages that deal with artists: The Composer and The Choreographer.

From these four groups in the K-6 series, five packages were chosen for field trial in 1971-72: Constructing Dramatic Plot; Relating Sound and Movement, Creating Word Pictures; Creating Characterization; and Investigating the Elements: Meter. Each individual package has a stated goal. Constructing Dramatic Plot is designed to gain an understanding of dramatic plot as the selection and arrangement of the incidents, conflict, crisis, setting, characters, and resolution in a theatre experience. Relating Sound and Movement is designed to increase listening, looking, and moving skills and to elicit student awareness of the possibilities and effects of relating sound and movement. Through a series of activities, the student develops matching and contrasting relationships between sound and movement. Creating Word Pictures is structured to increase the student's perception of word combinations, the student discovers that words define or expand meaning as well as allow for new verbal images. Creating Characterization teaches that a character's emotions can be expressed physically and verbally, and color and texture are explored for their potential relationship to emotion and as stimuli for characterization. Investigating the Elements:

Meter familiarizes the student with the use of meter in musical composition. By listening to recorded musical selections, students identify duple meter and triple meter and the use of these meters in musical compositions.

Each individual package provides approximately ten hours of instruction and is composed of such things as slides, films, filmstrips, and puzzles. The actual age or grade level of use, however, varies according to individual students; some packages which are geared to the third level or third grade may be used in the fourth or fifth grade in some school systems or in other schools in the second grade. An arts specialist may use the package as a minimal base of instruction and then extend the concepts and skills. For the non-arts teacher the package may become, perhaps, the only source of instruction in the arts.

A child exposed to the Aesthetic Education Program will build skills in perceiving, analyzing, and reacting to beauty, order, and form. He will have experiences in making quality judgments using aesthetic criteria, weighing and valuing theatrical performances, music, dance events, works of visual art, films, and literary efforts. And throughout his involvement with the Program's materials, he will be encouraged to look, to listen, to feel, to enjoy.

FIELD TRIAL

The Southeastern Education Laboratory has been responsible for the extended pilot test activities (hereafter referred to as field trial) in Alabama, Florida and Georgia for the 1971-72

school year. The Laboratory's field trial of the Aesthetic Education Program involved 31 schools and 1 county-wide migrant program in the 3 states. This is a part of CEMREL'S nationwide testing of the Aesthetic Education Program in 23 states.

This section of the report will present the product evaluation phases, objectives, target population and field trial sites, description of implementation and evaluation.

Product Evaluation Stages

All major decisions regarding the nature and content of the individual instructional packages, as well as the program as a whole, are made on the basis of four evaluation stages.

Prototype production. During the first stage the most valuable evaluators of the materials and their effectiveness are children. Teaching children in small informal groups allows the developer to begin honing ideas. This process continues in meetings with the other artist-writers, and ideas and materials are further revised after consultation with staff associates. The focus, however, continues to be on the children. Their enjoyment in using the package is always one criterion of success, and activities that bore them are among those that are rethought, redesigned, or deleted. After several such sessions with the children when appropriate ideas, activities, procedures and materials have been developed and organized, a complete instructional package evolves and is ready for a "hothouse trial."

Hothouse trials. The various elements--completed activities, materials, tests and teacher-student instructions--are assembled into the first complete package, and it is made ready for classroom use. An observer from CEMREL'S evaluation staff attends every session during the hothouse trial, watching for and noting successes as well as difficulties encountered in the use patterns and design of the physical materials, the teacher-learner instructions, and student behaviors as they relate to the objectives of the package. Prototype assessment devices for each package receive the same trial as the carrier activities themselves. This stage differs from the preceding stage in that (1) the package is complete for the first time, (2) an actual classroom setting is used, (3) a classroom teacher does the teaching or managing of the package in at least one of the trials, (4) the teaching of the package is observed by a member of the evaluation staff and curriculum developer, and (5) the data are more systematically collected.

Pilot test. The third step, the pilot test, is designed to learn whether the package is capable of standing alone in the hands of non-arts teachers; whether the prescribed instructional procedures lead to the designated outcomes with children of different ethnic groups and socioeconomic levels and the degree to which these outcomes can be expected to generalize to similar student populations; whether the teachers and students actually enjoyed using the package, and the degree to which

the assessment devices accurately reflect student learning.

In two pilot tests, each involving five packages, the non-arts teachers have given valuable feedback about classroom management and format of materials and have made suggestions about the structure of the learning activities. For example, the Creating Characterization package was pilot tested with puppets included in the materials. Teacher and student concerns about difficulties in manipulating the puppets let to redesigning the puppets as masks to fulfill the same instructional objective.

The media for assessment are as carefully planned and designed as the rest of the package materials, and include checklists with which the students evaluate the work of their peers, filmed assessment items, and slide reproductions of the art works. In Creating Word Pictures, students demonstrate what they have learned by taking a posttest that parallels one activity in the package, the "What is . . . ? Game" In Texture: Visual/Tactile, they match photographs of environmental textures to rendering of those textures in reproductions of works of art.

Extended pilot test. The fourth evaluation step is presently being carried out in schools in several states. The extended pilot testing is conducted in several different ways to serve different functions, but in each instance the materials are used by regular classroom teachers under the normal supervision and administration of the school.

At the time of the extended pilot test stage, the packages are considered to be stable and the feedback from this stage

will be used for summative and/or comparative purposes by the product developer.

Objectives

The primary purpose of the CEMREL field trials (extended pilot test) with the Aesthetic Education Program was to evaluate the relationship between AEP and the total school instructional program. The following kinds of information were collected in order to determine the degree to which the objective was achieved:

1) description of the type of student population served;

2) estimation of the degree of acceptance of the aesthetic education packages by teachers, administrators and students;

3) descriptions of the mechanics of the use of the packages in the classroom and the logistical problems encountered; and

4) description of communities and schools served by the program.

The evaluation section for AEP discusses these objectives in relation to the Laboratory's field trial of AEP.

Target Population and Field Trial Sites

As indicated in the description of the Program, AEP was not developed for a special segment of the school population, but rather for all the students in the school. Because the Program is supplementary in nature, it is not intended to replace any part of the current curriculum. Since the arts and

aesthetic concerns have played a secondary role in our educational system, the Aesthetic Education Program is designed to effect a more humanistic balance between aesthetic concerns and traditional concerns within the educational system.

It was the general goal at the outset of the project to involve five to ten schools in each of the three states. There are nine participating schools in Florida, thirteen in Georgia, and nine in Alabama (Appendix A). The ethnic composition and general geographic location the schools varied (Table 12).

TABLE 12. Number of schools participating in AEP field trial

	Alabama		Georgia		Florida	
	Urban/ Suburb	Rural	Urban/ Suburb	Rural	Urban/ Suburb	Rural
Predominantly white	2	3	2	6	2	4
Predominantly black	2	2	2	3	1	2
Mixed ethnic groups (black, white and Spanish-speaking)	--	--	--	--	--	County-wide migrant program

The organizational pattern of the schools ranged from self-contained classrooms to a cluster arrangement with grade levels varying from K-6 in Florida, 1-6 in Georgia, and 1-5, 1-6 and

1-8 in Alabama. The developer recommended that the packages be implemented in grades 2-5. Specific grade placement in any one school, however, was left to the judgment of the teachers and administrators in that school.

Description of Implementation

During the fall of 1971, curriculum coordinators and other key state department of education officials in Alabama, Florida, and Georgia were contacted concerning the Aesthetic Education Program. The Field Trial Coordinator met individually with representatives of each of the three departments to describe the Program and to arrange a statewide meeting for local school system personnel. The Laboratory executed a formal agreement with one state department of education (Appendix E). With the other two states a more informal letter of understanding was written. Based upon suggestions of the state department representatives, 15 to 20 school systems were identified in each of the three states as possible participants in the field trial of AEP. Invitations were issued to the curriculum coordinators, supervisors, principals and/or superintendents of the local systems to attend a meeting describing the Program.

Orientation meetings were held in the state department of education offices in Montgomery, Alabama, Tallahassee, Florida and Atlanta, Georgia. The Laboratory's Field Trial Coordinator and the Project Director presented the Program. State department consultants also indicated their reactions to the

Program at these meetings.

From this exposure to the materials, local system personnel decided to participate or not to participate in the field trial. Many systems who desired to participate were prevented from doing so in the 1971-72 school year by the lack of available local funds to purchase the student materials.

A two-day familiarization workshop was scheduled for the systems who were to participate in the field trial. Altogether, four workshops were conducted. They were held in Tallahassee and Belle Glade, Florida; Atlanta, Georgia; and Birmingham (Vestavia Hills), Alabama. These workshops were conducted by a CEMREL staff person and the Laboratory staff and were attended by various school personnel including administrators and regular classroom teachers as well as arts specialists, persons from institutions of higher education and state departments of education. The prime objective of these workshops was to familiarize the participants with the Aesthetic Education Program learning packages so that they could operate effectively in the field trial of the materials.

The workshop format included approximately two hours of discussion on the objectives, concepts, and procedures for teaching the packages. This was followed by sessions in which the participants actually became involved in the activities of each package. All of these sessions were oriented to learning/teaching conditions for specific packages. Participants discovered that

developing aural, visual, and kinetic perceptions, engaging in problem solving, and exploring varying modes of expression were all primary concerns of the package activities. The workshops also included a discussion of the evaluation items which are part of the packages and a review of the questionnaires developed for field trial purposes.

The participants in these workshops returned to their individual schools/systems and instructed other teachers in that school/system in the procedures for implementation of the Aesthetic Education Program.

Evaluation

An evaluation will be presented for each of the five packages that were incorporated in the field trial: Constructing Dramatic Plot; Relating Sound and Movement; Creating Word Pictures; Creating Characterization; and Investigating the Elements: Meter.

A particular package will be judged capable of standing alone (in the hands of elementary teachers who are not arts specialists) to the degree that (1) the prescribed instructional materials and suggested procedures lead to the desired learning or experiences on the part of the students; (2) the Teacher's guide and other accompanying materials provide the necessary explanation, support or background for the successful implementation of the prescribed instructional procedures; and (3) the time and effort expended in preparation and classroom instruc-

tion are judged by teachers to be within the practical requirements of elementary school scheduling.

Teacher questionnaires (Appendix G) were completed by a random sample of those teachers who implemented each of the five packages. The teachers' responses to the questionnaires, their students' reactions to the materials and their comments and/or recommendations follow.

Constructing Dramatic Plot. None of the teachers who implemented this package had any special qualifications in the arts. An average of 40 minutes was spent with the materials 3 days per week for a 4-6 week period. The classes which were usually rescheduled for the package lessons included art, social studies, language arts and reading.

All of the teachers sampled (N=14) indicated that the Teacher's Guide adequately explained the content to be taught to the students. They also felt that the Guide related well the content of the package to aesthetic education. The outline of suggested procedures for instruction was judged "adequate," but the criteria provided to assess student learning were considered "slightly inadequate" with minor rewriting needed. All of the teachers considered the Guide "well organized."

In regard to the need for a teacher workshop prior to package use, 37% indicated that one was "probably unnecessary," 37% indicated that it was "highly advisable," and 26% felt that a workshop was "completely unnecessary" to facilitate the imple-

mentation of the package materials with the appropriate instructional impact and teacher understanding.

All of the teachers indicated that their students were quite excited about and looked forward to each lesson. They reported that some of their students voluntarily worked with the materials between regular lessons, i.e., free periods, lunch hours, etc., and that many of their students related or generalized the content of the package to other school subjects. No reading problems were encountered by the students on any of the components of the package.

Few difficulties were reported in physically using the package materials, but the most common problem involved the area required for the gameboards. Because of the size of classrooms and desks, only a limited number of children could be involved with the materials at any one time. The materials were considered graphically outstanding in appearance and able to withstand normal classroom use. The storage of the package when not in use was not a problem at any site.

At no time did any of the teachers find it necessary or desirable to deviate from the recommended teaching procedures in order to bolster or maintain the continuity or momentum of the unit.

In general, no problems were encountered in informally assessing student learning during the course of instruction. The students were able to successfully create and act out a

story with a crisis, resolution, conflict, characters, setting and incidents. The evaluation instruments included in the package were considered "fairly good" in regard to clarity of directions and length of time to administer the test. The instrument was judged "rather simple" to administer and score. The test instruments were considered "comprehensive" in regard to evaluating student performance across all major goals.

Relating Sound and Movement. The teachers who implemented this package had no special qualification in the arts that would give them an advantage, in comparison to their peers, in comprehending and teaching this particular package. An average 30-minute period was spent with the materials 3 days per week for a 3-4 week period. Free time and/or non-alloted time was used to work with the materials in 80% of the sites; 10% rescheduled a gym period and 10% used a social studies or a language arts period.

The content of the Teacher's Guide was judged "adequate" by all of the teachers responding (N=10); however, the manner in which the guide explained how the content of the package was related to aesthetic education was considered "slightly inadequate" and moderate rewriting was suggested. The Guide outline of suggested procedures for instruction and the criteria presented to assess student learning were reported as "quite adequate." All of the teachers considered the Teacher's Guide to be well organized.

The need for a teacher workshop prior to implementation of the package materials was considered "highly advisable" by 60% of the teachers while 40% indicated that it was "probably unnecessary."

The majority of teachers sampled reported the students were excited about the materials and looked forward to each lesson. Many of the students brought package-relevant materials from home, and some voluntarily worked with the materials between regular lessons, i.e., free periods, lunch hours, etc., while others volunteered to do additional suggested activities outside or regular class time. Some of the students related the content of the package to other school subjects.

The only reported difficulty with the physical use of the materials involved the flashlight belts. It was recommended that specific instructions be included in the package concerning battery size and installation procedures. The overall graphic appearance of the materials was considered outstanding, and the materials were able to withstand normal classroom use. Storage of the package when not in use was not considered to be a problem at any location.

No "forced modification" of recommended teaching procedures was indicated, nor were exploratory modifications reported. No component of the package presented any reading difficulty for the students.

In terms of assessing whether or not the students had learned the concepts and skills that comprised the goals or outcomes of the various activities, teachers reported the following. "Moderate difficulty" was reported in matching and contrasting sounds and movements, but only "minimal difficulty" in assessing student learning was reported in the discussion of the film "Fogarty Park." In regard to the evaluation instruments included in the package, the length of test time was considered "nicely brief" with no problems reported in administering and scoring the test. The instruments included in this package were assessed as "comprehensive" and provided sufficient information regarding student performance.

Creating Word Pictures. None of the teachers who implemented this package had any special qualifications in the arts. A 4-5 week period was spent with the materials with a 35 minute exposure 2-3 times per week. The package was usually scheduled within the language arts block of time. Only 4% of the teachers presented the material during free time and/or non-alloted time.

The content of the Teacher's Guide was judged "adequate;" however, the explanation of how the content related to aesthetic education was considered "slightly inadequate" with minor rewriting suggested. The general opinion was that the Guide was "well organized" and contained "adequate suggestions" for procedures of instruction as well as "adequate criteria" for assessing student learning.

Responses indicated that 78% of the teachers felt it "highly advisable" to have a teacher workshop prior to implementation of the package materials but 22% considered a workshop "probably unnecessary."

All of the teachers sampled (N=10) indicated that their students were quite excited about and looked forward to each lesson. Many students voluntarily worked with the package materials between regular lessons, i.e., during free periods, lunch hours, etc., and many students related the content of the package to other school subjects. Few brought package-relevant materials from home and raised questions not covered in the regular activities.

Few difficulties were reported with the physical use of the materials; however, a concern was registered regarding the durability of the word cards after extended use. The graphic appearance of the materials was considered good.

No one found it necessary or desirable to deviate from the recommended teaching procedures in order to maintain the continuity and momentum of the unit. Only minimal exploratory modifications in teaching procedures were reported, including the students' drawing the images and exhibiting them for their classmates.

The reading level of the Word Books presented a problem for some of the students, as well as the format. After some experience with the format, however, the problem diminished.

The following difficulties were reported in connection with assessing student learning during the course of instruction. "Minimal difficulty" was reported in using words related to the senses and combining words to produce new images. Transposing words and word images, creating word pictures, and describing sense perceptions caused "moderate problems." No problems were encountered in discussing the story "Wilhelmena." "Minimal difficulty" was experienced with repositioned words in sequence to effect changes. The length of test time of the evaluation instrument was considered "fairly good" and no problems were encountered in administering and scoring the diagnostic activities. The instrumentation accompanying this package was considered "comprehensive" and provided sufficient information regarding student performance.

Creating Characterization. None of the teachers who taught this package had any special qualifications in the arts that would give them an advantage, compared to their peers, in comprehending and teaching Creating Characterization. The lessons were usually incorporated in the language arts and social studies classes.

The content of the Teacher's Guide was considered adequate by all of the responding (n=13) teachers. The criteria for assessment of student learning and the suggested procedures

for instruction were also reported "adequate;" however, the section of the guide which related the content of the package to aesthetic education was considered "rather vague" and moderate rewriting was suggested. Every user rated the Guide as "well organized."

Student reactions to the materials were positive. Because of the great amount of class time spent with the materials, very little opportunity existed for the students to voluntarily work with the materials between regular lessons; however, many volunteered to do additional suggested activities outside of regular class time. Many related the content of the package to other school subjects.

Few difficulties were reported in physically using the materials; however, the section dividers in the boxes were not sturdy enough to withstand normal use, and the individual pieces of the picture composites were not marked so that the sets could be reassembled after student use. The materials were considered graphically outstanding in appearance, especially the Emotion Books and EMO masks. Storage of the package materials when not in use was not reported to be a problem.

No forced modifications of teaching procedures were necessary and only minimal exploratory modifications were reported. None of the components of the package presented any reading difficulties for the students.

Only moderate difficulty was reported in assessing student learning when emotions were being expressed non-vocally. The use of color and texture in characterization presented problems in terms of isolating the concepts and skills to be assessed in the various activities.

The length of time to administer the pre- and posttests was considered "nicely brief;" however, the teacher evaluation in Lesson 4 was judged "too long" and "quite difficult" to administer and score. The evaluation instruments accompanying this package were considered comprehensive and provided sufficient information regarding student performance.

Investigating the Elements: Meter. Sixty-five percent of the teachers who implemented the Meter package were music teachers. The remaining 35% had no special training in the arts that would give them any advantage in comprehending and teaching the Meter package. An average of 25 minutes was spent with the materials 4 times a week for a 4-5 week period. Music and free and/or non-allotted time were the periods normally used for the package lessons.

Thirty-seven percent of the teachers sampled (N=11) indicated that the Teacher's Guide was "slightly inadequate" in the section which explained the content to be taught to the students. However, all of them reported the Guide to be adequate in relating the package content to aesthetic education as well as sufficiently outlining the procedures for instruction. The Guide was reported

well organized by all the teachers.

Twenty-four percent of the teachers indicated that a teacher workshop was completely unnecessary prior to implementation of the package materials, but 76% indicated that a familiarization workshop was desirable prior to package use.

The teachers stated that general student reaction to the materials was positive with one exception. At one site, the students were reported to be ambivalent in their response to the lessons. Because of the nature of the package materials, few students volunteered to work with the materials between regular lessons. Many students, however, volunteered to do additional activities outside regular class time and also related the content of the package to other school subjects.

No difficulties in physically using the package materials were reported. The graphics of the materials were judged to be "good" and the materials themselves able to withstand normal classroom use. Storage of the materials when not in use was not reported to be a problem. Since very little reading was required in connection with this package, no difficulties were indicated in this area.

In determining if the students had learned the concepts and skills that comprised the goals of the various activities, teachers encountered few difficulties. Minimal difficulty was reported in recognizing and accenting odd-time meters in compositions. Moderate difficulty was reported in clapping to musical

examples of odd-time meters. No forced or exploratory modifications of teaching procedures were noted. The test instruments accompanying this package were generally acceptable. The length of test time was judged reasonable, and no problems were reported in administering and scoring the tests. The instrumentation accompanying this package was considered very comprehensive and provided adequate information regarding student performance.

DISCUSSION

The Aesthetic Education Program materials were considered a meaningful addition to the curriculum by both teachers and administrators alike. Even though some of the schools had a program in the arts, the AEP materials tended to expand and broaden the current program rather than replace it in any way. In those schools where no arts program existed, the AEP materials represented the only instruction for students in the arts.

A minimum amount of revision of the materials was suggested by the teachers. The Teacher's Guide was cited most often as needing revision and suggestions were made for clarification in relating the content of the packages to aesthetic education. There was a wide range of response as to the necessity of a teacher workshop prior to package use; however, a majority of the teachers indicated that a workshop was advisable.

The teachers reported that their students were excited about the lessons and in many instances voluntarily worked with

the materials on their own time. Few difficulties were reported in the physical use of the materials and the packages were considered to be graphically outstanding in appearance by most of the users.

Some of the schools did not complete an evaluation of the materials because the packages arrived late in the school year, and the teachers did not have sufficient time to work with the materials in order to make a valid evaluation. These teachers will complete an evaluation in the fall of 1972. Also, additional schools within the participating systems will be added to the field trial in the fall as well as other systems.

Some states education agencies are requiring that a minimum program in art and music be included in the school's program to satisfy accreditation requirements; the Aesthetic Education Program materials can satisfy this need quite effectively. Results of the field trials this year indicate that the Aesthetic Education Program was successful and that it could be installed in the schools with a minimum amount of teacher training.

IV

PROJECTIONS FOR 1972-73

Nearly all of the teachers and principals who have implemented either the Wisconsin Design or the Aesthetic Education Program talk with enthusiasm about the programs and their benefits to teachers and children. Because of the favorable reaction to both programs, the Laboratory has been concerned about the schools' future use of materials and has taken steps to assure continuity of implementation.

WISCONSIN DESIGN

All seven of the original field test schools, having implemented Word Attack for two years and Study Skills for less than one year, plan to continue their work with the Design in 1972 and beyond. They also anticipate being included by the Wisconsin Center in the field test of the Comprehension element in 1973.

In view of the Laboratory's discontinuing its field test role and the schools' desire to continue with the program, the Laboratory arranged a one-day meeting in Atlanta on April 21, 1972. At least one representative from each school attended. Conducted by Center and Laboratory staff, the meeting was intended to establish channels for a continuing relationship between the schools and the Wisconsin Center and to inform the schools of their field test status beyond August 1972. They will technically be Type II field test schools, receiving no financial

support from the Center. In one respect, however, they will be unlike the "regular" Type II schools; Comprehension materials will be available to them in the initial stages of the field test rather than at the beginning of the second year of the field test.

Since this is the last year of the Word Attack field test, all schools will be continuing independently in this area. For Study Skills, however, the field test is just beginning. The Wisconsin Center has encouraged the schools to participate in the administration of evaluation tests again in November 1972. Scores will then be compared to those obtained from the tests of November 1971 and furnished to the schools.

AESTHETIC EDUCATION PROGRAM

All of the school systems who were involved in the field trial of the Aesthetic Education Program materials in the 1971-72 school year will continue using the Program during 1972-73 and beyond. CEMREL will maintain contact with these schools in order to gather data required for Program evaluation and refinement.

During the summer and early fall of 1972, the Field Trial Coordinator is continuing to make initial presentations to local school system personnel, college and university staffs, and other interested educators. Provided funds are made available for teacher orientation and assistance, CEMREL hopes to expand the field trial of AEP in this region during the 1972-73 school year.

REFERENCES

Askov, E. A Study of the Wisconsin Design for Reading Skill Development through a Case History Approach. Working Paper No. 68. Madison: Wisconsin Research and Development Center for Cognitive Learning, 1971.

Basic Program Plan. St. Ann, Missouri: CEMREL, 1972.

Champlin, N. "Education and the Aesthetic Revolution." Address to the faculty of the School of Education, San Francisco State College, California, April 7, 1968.

Heckscher, A. "The Quality of American Culture," The Report of the President's Commission on National Goals. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentiss-Hall, 1960.

Johnson, S. First-Year Field Test of the Wisconsin Design for Reading Skill Development. Atlanta: Southeastern Education Laboratory, 1971. (a)

Johnson, S. Quality Verification of the Regional Resource File for the Wisconsin Design for Reading Skill Development. Atlanta: Southeastern Education Laboratory, 1971. (b)

Klausmeier, H. J., M. Quilling, J. Sorenson, R. Way, and G. Gasrud. Individually Guided Education and the Multi-unit Elementary School. Madison: Wisconsin Research and Development Center for Cognitive Learning, 1971.

Kucera, H., & W. N. Francis. Computational Analysis of Present-Day American English. Providence: Brown University Press, 1967.

Otto, W., and E. Askov. The Wisconsin Design for Reading Skill Development: Rationale and Guidelines. Minneapolis, Minnesota: National Computer Systems, 1970.

Quilling, M. Field Test Plan: The Wisconsin Design for Reading Skill Development: Word Attack Element. Technical Memo QV-19-71. Madison: Wisconsin Research and Development Center for Cognitive Learning, 1971. (a)

Quilling, M. Field Test Plan: The Wisconsin Design for Reading Skill Development: Study Skills Element. Technical Memo QV-21-71. Madison: Wisconsin Research and Development Center for Cognitive Learning, 1971. (b)

Read, H. The Redemption of the Robot: My Encounter with Education through Art. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1966.

Weitz, M. "What Is the Nature of Art?" The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Curriculum, 1965, 15, 27-35.

APPENDIXES

		Page
A	Lists of Schools Participating in Design and AEP Field Tests	85
B	Evaluation-Related Tests for Each Grade: Word Attack	87
	Evaluation-Related Tests for Each Grade: Study Skills	89
C	Growth Record for Individuals	91
D	Word Attack Skill Group Record	92
E	Memorandum of Agreement: Word Attack	93
	Memorandum of Agreement: Study Skills	95
	Memorandum of Understanding: AEP	98
F	Grade 1 Means for Each School for 1970-72: Word Attack	103
	Grade 2 Means for Each School for 1970-72: Word Attack	104
	Grade 3 Means for Each School for 1970-72; Word Attack	105
	Grade 4 Means for Each School for 1971-72: Word Attack	106
	Raw Scores on Study Skills Evaluation Tests, November 1971	107
G	Teacher Questionnaire: Relating Sound and Movement	110

APPENDIX A

Lists of Schools Participating in Design and AEP Field Tests

Wisconsin Design for Reading Skill Development

Allapattah Elementary School
Miami, Florida
Mosely Doles, Principal

Capitol Avenue School
Atlanta, Georgia
Joseph Draper, Principal

Cooper Street School
Atlanta, Georgia
Claude George, Jr., Principal

McDonnell Elementary School
Huntsville, Alabama
Elizabeth Hall, Principal

Moore Haven Elementary School
Moore Haven, Florida
A. M. Richie, Principal

Santa Clara Elementary School
Miami, Florida
Leonard Greenbaum, Principal

West Elementary School
Cullman, Alabama
Raymond Clarke, Principal

Winston Elementary School
Winston, Georgia
Doyle Minter, Principal

Aesthetic Education Program

Alabama

Berry Elementary School
Berry, Alabama

Dickson Elementary School
Mobile, Alabama

Fayette Elementary School
Fayette, Alabama

Hubbertville Elementary School
Fayette, Alabama

Mountain Gap Elementary School
Huntsville, Alabama

Vestavia Hills Elementary School
Vestavia Hills, Alabama

Westlawn Elementary School
Decatur, Alabama

Woodmeade Elementary School
Decatur, Alabama

Wright Elementary School
Birmingham, Alabama

Aesthetic Education Program

Georgia

Big A Elementary School
Toccoa, Georgia

Carnes Creek Elementary School
Toccoa, Georgia

Dacula Elementary School
Dacula, Georgia

Eastanollee Elementary School
Eastanollee, Georgia

Fernbank Elementary School
Atlanta, Georgia

Fitzgerald Elementary School
Fitzgerald, Georgia

Grayson Elementary School
Grayson, Georgia

Merritts Elementary School
Toccoa, Georgia

Stephens County Junior High School
Eastanollee, Georgia

Sugar Hill Elementary School
Buford, Georgia

Terry Mill Elementary School
Atlanta, Georgia

Toccoa Elementary School
Toccoa, Georgia

Villa Rica Primary School
Villa Rica, Georgia

Florida

Astoria Park Elementary School
Tallahassee, Florida

Bonifay Elementary School
Bonifay, Florida

Canal Point Elementary School
Canal Point, Florida

Douglas Elementary School
Key West, Florida

Gove Elementary School
Belle Glade, Florida

Madison Middle School
Madison, Florida

May Sandes Exceptional Child Center
Key West, Florida

South Hamilton Elementary School
White Springs, Florida

Suwannee Elementary School
Live Oak, Florida

APPENDIX B1

Evaluation-Related Tests for Each Grade: Word Attack

GRADE 1

Sitting 1 Wisconsin Tests of Reading Skill Development-Level A
- Test 1 Rhyming words (15 items)
- Test 5 Words & Phrases (15 items)
- Test 7 Initial consonants (15 items)

Sitting 2 Wisconsin Tests of Reading Skill Development-Level B
- Test 3 Beginning consonant sounds (20 items)
- Test 5 Consonant blends (20 items)
- Test 6 Rhyming elements (20 items)

Sitting 3 Wisconsin Tests of Reading Skill Development-Level B
- Test 8 Consonant digraphs-sh, ch, th (17 items)
- Test 9 Compound words (17 items)
- Test 12 Plurals (12 items)

GRADE 2

Sitting 1 Cooperative Primary Tests
- Word Analysis (60 items)

Sitting 2 Wisconsin Tests of Reading Skill Development-Level B
- Test 3 Beginning consonant sounds (20 items)
- Test 5 Consonant blends (20 items)
- Test 6 Rhyming elements (20 items)

Sitting 3 Wisconsin Tests of Reading Skill Development-Level B
- Test 7 Short vowels (15 items)
- Test 10 Contractions (15 items)
- Test 11 Base words & endings (12 items)

Sitting 4 Wisconsin Tests of Reading Skill Development-Level C
- Test 3 Consonant blends (15 items)
- Test 4 Long vowel sounds (30 items)
- Test 12 Consonant digraphs (15 items)

GRADE 3

Sitting 1 Cooperative Primary Tests
Word Analysis (60 items)

Sitting 2 Stanford Achievement PII
Word Meaning (36 items)
Word Study Skills (64 items)

Sitting 3 Wisconsin Tests of Reading Skill Development-Level C
Test 3 Consonant blends (15 items)
Test 4 Long vowel sounds (30 items)
Test 12 Consonant digraphs (15 items)

Sitting 4 Wisconsin Tests of Reading Skill Development-Level C
Test 5 Vowel + r, a + l, a + w (17 items)
Test 5 Diphthongs (15 items)
Test 16 Synonyms & antonyms (16 items)
Test 2 Three-letter consonant blends (18 items, Level D)

GRADE 4

Sitting 1 Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills
Vocabulary (40 items)
Comprehension (45 items)

Sitting 2 Wisconsin Tests of Reading Skill Development-Level C
Test 5 Vowel + r, a + l, a + w (17 items)
Test 6 Diphthongs (15 items)
Test 16 Synonyms & antonyms (16 items)
Test 2 Three letter consonant blends (18 items, Level D)

Sitting 3 Wisconsin Tests of Reading Skill Development-Level D
Test 3 Silent letters (15 items)
Test 4 Syllabication (15 items)
Test 5 Accent (20 items)
Test 7 Possessives (18 items)

APPENDIX B2

Evaluation-Related Tests for Each Grade: Study Skills

GRADE 3

Sitting I	B 3	Picture grid (15)
	C 9	Bar graphs (15)
	C 10	Multicolumn tables (15)
Sitting II	B 5	Measurement: distance (10)
	B 6	Picture graphs (15)
	B 7	Single Column tables (15)
Sitting III	Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills, Level 1 Study Skills (26)	

GRADE 4

Sitting I	B 6	Picture graphs (15)
	C 8	Picture graphs (15)
	C 9	Bar graphs (15)
Sitting II	B 5	Measurement: distance (10)
	C 2	Semipictorial symbols (10)
	C 7	Measurement: distance (15)
Sitting III	Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills, Level 1 Study Skills (26)	

GRADE 5

Break-in	Wisconsin Tests of Reading Skill Development: Level C

Sitting I	B 3	Picture grid (15)
	C 4	Street grid (15)
	D 3	Number - letter grid (15)
Sitting II	D 4	Cardinal directions (20)
	D 6	Picture graphs (15)
	D 8	Circle graphs (10)
Sitting III	Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills, Level 2, Study Skills (25)	

GRADE 6

Break-in	Wisconsin Tests of Reading Skill Development	
Sitting I	C 10	Multicolumn tables (15)
	D 9	Multicolumn tables (15)
	E 7	Multicolumn tables (20)
Sitting II	C 2	Semipictorial symbols (10)
	D 1	Nonpictorial symbols (20)
	E 1	Point & line symbols (15)
Sitting III	C 9	Bar graphs (15)
	D 7	Bar graphs (15)
	E 6	Bar graphs (15)
Sitting IV	Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills, Level 2, Study Skills (25)	

APPENDIX C

GROWTH RECORD FOR INDIVIDUALS

School_____ Grade/Unit_____

NAME	SEX	ACHMT LEVEL	SKILLS AT ENTRY	SKILLS JANUARY	SKILLS MAY, 1972

WORD ATTACK SKILL GROUP RECORD

School _____ Teacher _____ Grade _____

Skill	Date Begun	No. in group	Date Ended	No. mastering skill	% mastering skill	Type of assessment*

*This can be paper-and-pencil, teacher observation through individual assessment, teacher judgment.

APPENDIX E1

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

FIELD TEST OF THE
WISCONSIN DESIGN FOR READING SKILL DEVELOPMENT: WORD ATTACK

The Southeastern Education Laboratory and the
School System agree to cooperatively field test during the 1971-72 academic year the Word Attack element of the Wisconsin Design for Reading Skill Development in

GENERAL

The Laboratory reserves the right to tabulate, analyze, evaluate, and publish data collected during the field test in the form and manner deemed appropriate by the Laboratory in consultation with the Wisconsin Research and Development Center for Cognitive Learning, the developers of the Design.

The Laboratory further reserves the right to obtain and hold copyright to materials in which data collected from this field test are published by the Laboratory.

The Laboratory reserves the right to make video tapes, audio tapes, and photographs of facilities, pupils, and teachers to the extent that these activities do not interfere with classroom instruction.

The System certifies that it is in compliance with executive orders 11246 and 11375 which prohibit employment practices based upon discrimination of race, creed, color, religion, national origin, or sex.

SPECIFIC RESPONSIBILITIES

The Laboratory or the Center will provide to the school:

1. Financial support for the diagnostic and mastery testing of one-half of the pupils in the participating school.

2. All teacher materials included in the Design, and a management system to facilitate record keeping and easy use of the records.

3. Tests used in gathering baseline data in Spring 1972.

4. Feedback to the school system in the form of (1) reports of on-site visits by the Field Test Coordinator at least three times during the year, and (2) a final written report to be completed by August 30, 1972.

5. Consultant services as needed. The system should, however, recognize that the purpose of the field test is to learn whether the product can be used effectively with the support of only the local staff, with minimal consultative aid.

The System agrees to:

1. Provide financial support for the diagnostic and mastery testing of one-half of the pupils in the participating school.

2. Furnish file boxes and notchers used to maintain the Resource File and Student Profile Cards.

3. Make available at least two full days of staff inservice for all new participating teachers. This inservice will be conducted by local leaders who have attended a Laboratory-conducted conference and who have had experience with the Design during 1970-71. Of the two days inservice, at least one day will be scheduled before school begins; the other during the school year.

4. Engage all eligible K-4 pupils and staff in the participating school in the program.

5. Pay any shipping costs for sending tests to the vendor for machine scoring.

6. Devote a minimum of two classroom hours weekly to reading skill development as specified in the Rationale and Guidelines of the Design; devote at least two hours weekly for teacher planning time.

7. Coordinate the school system's testing program with the Design testing program; provide up to two hours of pupil time for the gathering of criterion data yearly; apprise the Laboratory of the local testing program; and share with the Laboratory any intelligence or achievement data from the participating school, gathered through the system's testing program.

8. Inform the Laboratory in advance of school boundary changes affecting over 10% of the enrollment of the school, so that termination of the field test at the affected grade levels can be jointly considered.

9. Provide up to one hour of pupil time in May 1972 for baseline testing. Teachers will administer the tests.

10. Supply any resources(textbooks, records, visuals) normally provided in support of any reading program.

FUNDING. No interchange of funds is involved in this agreement.

CANCELLATION. If, during the term of this agreement or its extension, conditions develop which prevent continuation of the field test of the Design, both parties agree to negotiate a termination date.

APPENDIX E2

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

FIELD TEST OF THE

WISCONSIN DESIGN FOR READING SKILL DEVELOPMENT: STUDY SKILLS

The Southeastern Education Laboratory and the School system agree to cooperatively field test during the 1971-72 academic year the Study Skills element of the Wisconsin Design for Reading Skill Development in

GENERAL

The Laboratory reserves the right to tabulate, analyze, evaluate, and publish data collected during the field test in the form and manner deemed appropriate by the Laboratory in consultation with the Wisconsin Research and Development Center for Cognitive Learning, the developers of the Design.

The Laboratory further reserves the right to obtain and hold copyright to materials in which data collected from this field test are published by the Laboratory.

The Laboratory reserves the right to make video tapes, audio tapes, and photographs of facilities, pupils, and teachers to the extent that these activities do not interfere with classroom instruction.

The System certifies that it is in compliance with executive orders 11246 and 11375 which prohibit employment practices based upon discrimination of race, creed, color, religion, national origin, or sex.

SPECIFIC RESPONSIBILITIES

The Laboratory or the Center will provide to the school:

1. Financial support for the diagnostic and mastery testing of one-half of the pupils in the participating school.

2. All teacher materials included in the Design, and a management system to facilitate record keeping and easy use of the records.

3. Tests used in gathering baseline data in Spring 1972.

4. Partial financial support for the purchase of commercial instructional materials required to implement the Study Skills element. The exact amount

will be determined according to each school's needs.

5. Feedback to the school system in the form of (1) reports of on-site visits by the Field Test Coordinator at least three times during the year, and (2) a final written report to be completed by August 30, 1972.

6. Consultant services as needed. The system should, however, recognize that the purpose of the field test is to learn whether the product can be used effectively with the support of only the local staff, with minimal consultative aid.

The System agrees to:

1. Provide financial support for the diagnostic and mastery testing of one-half of the pupils in the participating school.

2. Make available at least two full days of staff inservice for all participating teachers. This inservice will be conducted by local leaders who have attended a Laboratory-conducted conference. Of the two days inservice, at least one day will be scheduled before school begins; the other during the school year.

3. Engage all eligible K-6 pupils and staff in the participating school in the program.

4. Pay any shipping costs for sending tests to the vendor for machine scoring.

5. Devote an adequate amount of time (to be specified later) to the teaching of study skills. Instruction will be based on the continuous progress of the child without respect to grade or "level" designations.

6. Coordinate the school system's testing program with the Design testing program; provide up to two hours of pupil time for the gathering of criterion data yearly; apprise the Laboratory of the local testing program; and share with the Laboratory any intelligence or achievement data from the participating school, gathered through the system's testing program.

7. Inform the Laboratory in advance of school boundary changes affecting over 10% of the enrollment of the school, so that termination of the field test at the affected grade levels can be jointly considered.

8. Provide an adequate amount of time during the 1971-72 school year for purposes of gathering data on pupils now in grades K-6. Teachers presently in the building will administer the tests.

9. Provide sufficient instructional materials to carry out a comprehensive program of study skills.

FUNDING

The Laboratory will provide to the schools part of the funds needed to purchase classroom materials so that the school can adequately implement a comprehensive study skills program. The exact amount will be determined according to need, through individual conferences with each school. Upon receipt of invoice copies, the Laboratory will reimburse the school for the percentage previously agreed on.

CANCELLATION. If, during the term of this agreement or its extension, conditions develop which prevent continuation of the field test of the Design, both parties agree to negotiate a termination date.

EXTENSION. If, during the term of this agreement, it is determined by the Laboratory that the field test necessitates extension of this agreement, the System agrees to extend this agreement under the same terms and conditions or to renegotiate the agreement on terms and conditions acceptable to both parties.

Project Director	Signature
Southeastern Education Laboratory	Title
Date	School System
	Date

APPENDIX E3

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

This agreement, made and entered into this _____

day of _____, 19___ involving

The Florida Department of Education
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

hereinafter called the State Department, and

Southeastern Education Laboratory
Georgetown Square Office Park, Suite 207
1750 Old Springhouse Lane, N. E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30341

hereinafter called SEL, and

CEMREL, Inc.
10646 St. Charles Rock Road
St. Ann, Missouri 63074

hereinafter called CEMREL.

The parties do hereby understand and agree as follows:

1. Purpose

The purpose of this Memorandum of Understanding is to enter into a cooperative agreement among the State Department, SEL, and CEMREL to initiate and implement a pilot education program utilizing CEMREL's Aesthetic Education Program materials.

2. Period of Performance

A. The period of performance of this Memorandum of Understanding shall be from February 1, 1972 through June 30, 1973 inclusive.

B. It is the intention of the State Department, SEL, and CEMREL to participate in extension or renewals of the Memorandum of Understanding by mutual agreement over a period of five years. Such extension or renewals are subject to availability of funds for the work of the activities and subject to agreement by the State Department, SEL, and CEMREL that the prior performance of the parties has been satisfactory.

C. The performance by the State Department of any of its obligations under this Memorandum of Understanding shall be subject to and contingent upon the availability of monies lawfully applicable to such purpose.

3. Scope of Work

A. During the period of performance, the State Department agrees:

1) to designate a coordinating office within the Department to centralize and implement its facilitation and liaison interests;

2) to designate contact persons from its staff who will work with the districts in implementing the CEMREL Aesthetic Education materials;

3) to identify teacher education institutions who will serve also as a resource to the participating schools;

4) to consult with the participating School District concerning the continuation and/or expansion of the Aesthetic Education program;

5) to encourage various school districts to participate in the pilot aesthetic education program but the State Department does not guarantee the participation of any certain number of school districts or guarantee the performance of any participating school district that utilizes the CEMREL Aesthetic Education materials.

B. During the period of performance, SEL agrees:

1) to serve as a cooperating agency in planning and implementing the Pilot Aesthetic Education Program in the State of Florida;

2) to assist in planning and executing orientation sessions for chief school administrators, principals, local coordinators;

3) to plan and execute orientation workshops in the Spring of 1972 for those teachers and coordinators who will be using the materials during the 1971-72 and 1972-73 school years;

C. During the period of performance, CEMREL agrees:

1) to assist in planning and executing orientation workshops and inservice training sessions for the teachers and coordinators who will be using the materials;

2) to furnish materials and make available all aesthetic education program materials to the participating schools.

D. During the period of performance, the participating schools have agreed:

1) to designate from its staff a local coordinator who will be responsible for the conduct of the CEMREL Aesthetic Education Program materials;

2) to identify by name teacher(s) in the pilot school who will use the materials and to develop a proposed time schedule for their use in order that review schedules can be designed and maintained;

3) to provide the State Department, SEL, and CEMREL a list of the names of the pilot school's principal, the local coordinator, and the teacher(s) involved in the Pilot Aesthetic Education Program;

4) to insure and support the participation of the pilot school principal, the local coordinator, and the specified teachers in orientation sessions and summer workshops as mutually agreed upon by the parties;

5) to implement and pace the instruction in accordance with the provisions of the teacher's manuals contained in the Aesthetic Education Program materials;

6) to allow authorized observation of the materials in use;

7) to collect essential data for the Aesthetic Education Program as agreed upon by the Participant, the State Department, SEL and CEMREL;

8) to purchase Aesthetic Education Program materials for use in each of the elementary schools participating in the program.

4. Copyright

The CEMREL copyrights are not assigned or released by this agreement. Copyright to all additional instructional and/or training materials developed or revised in the course of this participation and as a result of the participation shall not be claimed by the Participant, SEL, or the State Department and may be claimed by CEMREL.

5. Liability

It is the intention of the parties that the initiation and implementation of the Pilot Aesthetic Education Program described herein shall require no expenditure of funds by the State Department. THEREFORE, CEMREL and SEL agree to indemnify, defend, save, and hold harmless the State Department from all claims, demands, or liabilities of any nature whatsoever and further CEMREL and SEL agree not to sue the State Department or any of its personnel for any loss, damage, or claims resulting from the relationship of the parties created by this agreement.

6. Authorized Use

The State Department, in representing the AEP materials, will encourage their use according to the purposes and procedures defined by CEMREL as being appropriate for the achievement of the educational goals for which they were intended.

7. Program Evaluation

The Participant agrees to allow evaluation data to be collected in relation to the Pilot Aesthetic Education Program. SEL, CEMREL, and the State Department will specify the data collection activities to be carried out and will work with the Participant in collecting the necessary data.

8. Program Expansion

In the second and subsequent years, the State Department will assist SEL in identifying other schools within the state desiring to design and implement an Aesthetic Education Program using the aforementioned materials.

9. Program Organization

For further details concerning the Pilot Aesthetic Education Program refer to the document entitled: "A Department of Education Plan for the Establishment of a Pilot Aesthetic Education Program in Cooperation with Selected Schools, CEMREL, and Other Interested Agencies."

10. News Releases

The Participant shall provide the State Department, SEL, and CEMREL with copies of news releases, items of public information and communication to parents, relating to the Pilot Aesthetic Education Program upon their release.

The parties hereto have executed this MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING as dated below on this document.

by _____ Date _____
Floyd T. Christian, Commissioner
Florida State Department of Education

by _____ Date _____
Kenneth W. Tidwell, Executive Director
Southeastern Education Laboratory

by _____ Date _____
Wade M. Robinson, President
CEMREL, Inc.

Table F1. Grade 1 means for each school for 1970-72: Word Attack

	Test and Number of Items								
	A1 (15)	A5 (15)	A7 (15)	B3 (20)	B5 (20)	B6 (20)	B8 (17)	B9 (17)	B12 (12)
School 1									
1972	12.83	13.21	14.00	17.78	17.17	14.61	10.90	10.90	9.00
1971	12.86	14.36	14.27	17.81	18.43	10.43	13.20	13.44	9.56
1970	11.54	14.38	14.54	14.46	15.62	9.35	14.65	14.58	9.81
School 2									
1972	11.13	14.00	14.26	17.25	13.90	10.15	13.08	9.88	8.72
1971	13.24	13.90	13.33	17.73	13.82	8.36	13.90	13.10	10.20
1970	9.03	13.24	10.82	17.49	14.43	8.14	9.21	11.32	9.03
School 3									
1972	12.17	12.96	11.74	13.88	8.96	6.80	9.12	9.00	7.81
1971	12.12	14.29	11.62	15.26	11.35	10.74	9.69	9.08	7.25
1970	---	---	---	10.75	12.00	11.05	5.29	7.52	7.24
School 4									
1972	13.16	13.68	10.47	10.90	5.75	8.40	4.94	7.67	6.89
1971	14.22	13.72	13.11	10.35	6.88	3.35	4.25	6.44	5.31
1970	8.40	11.00	6.00	---	---	---	---	---	---
School 5									
1972	12.04	13.96	12.04	17.21	14.87	16.83	10.04	10.00	8.46
1971	11.05	14.27	9.64	12.55	8.90	6.00	6.75	6.95	7.65
1970	Data not available								
School 6									
1972	12.24	14.24	13.40	15.87	15.71	11.46	13.79	13.17	8.87
1971	11.87	14.46	11.71	16.76	14.60	14.24	12.48	11.16	8.08
1970	10.50	12.36	10.71	14.24	13.44	9.60	7.96	7.70	6.48
School 7									
1972	10.32	12.92	10.40	14.16	9.12	8.60	6.46	10.00	8.33
1971	10.87	14.26	11.22	14.00	11.82	6.86	6.54	9.75	7.17
1970	Data not comparable								
COMBINED*									
1972	11.84	12.74	12.05	14.88	11.39	10.37	9.57	9.95	8.18
1971	12.23	14.15	11.77	14.44	11.23	8.57	8.94	9.41	7.61
1970	9.31	12.20	9.18	14.16	13.29	9.60	7.49	8.85	7.58

*School 1 was omitted from combined means in grade 1 because of its implementation of i.t.a.

Table F2. Grade 2 means for each school for 1970-72: Word Attack

Test and Number of Items

	CPT (60)	B3 (20)	B5 (20)	B6 (20)	B7 (15)	B10 (15)	B11 (12)	C3 (15)	C4 (30)	C12 (15)
School 1										
1972	47.94	19.17	18.70	19.26	13.46	12.00	10.17	14.25	24.12	14.00
1971	47.91	15.82	18.45	17.27	13.52	12.92	9.48	13.87	24.08	13.37
1970	49.52	12.26	16.32	12.32	11.52	12.36	8.60	12.21	22.37	12.67
School 2										
1972	44.52	17.58	17.87	18.62	11.17	10.42	9.21	12.74	21.26	11.22
1971	44.74	17.12	17.76	18.08	11.21	11.42	9.00	13.50	23.21	12.87
1970	41.60	17.25	15.18	12.86	12.08	11.60	6.68	13.04	21.04	11.80
School 3										
1972	38.33	15.35	13.22	13.39	9.59	9.82	7.36	8.26	16.13	10.17
1971	---	14.30	13.05	11.35	5.55	5.50	4.30	10.75	17.15	10.45
1970	---	14.89	12.67	10.67	4.38	3.24	3.76	5.91	14.45	8.00
School 4										
1972	26.35	15.06	8.81	9.25	5.37	6.06	6.19	5.82	12.59	7.18
1971	37.10	---	---	---	3.58	3.50	4.50	4.45	---	5.27
1970	33.81	Other data not available								
School 5										
1972	40.40	17.54	14.87	13.08	9.00	11.16	8.32	9.95	18.05	10.16
1971	41.26	17.04	16.87	12.35	8.91	11.09	9.39	10.65	20.52	10.74
1970	Data not available									
School 6										
1972	41.82	18.43	16.87	16.43	11.35	11.35	7.91	12.95	23.59	12.73
1971	49.39	17.58	17.45	15.82	---	---	---	13.60	24.40	13.00
1970	36.92	15.33	15.78	8.67	5.87	10.37	8.00	---	---	---
School 7										
1972	28.88	15.52	15.04	15.08	9.58	8.79	7.46	10.75	18.62	10.21
1971	35.76	14.12	14.52	14.36	6.65	5.96	6.48	8.95	13.14	8.00
1970	Data not comparable									
COMBINED										
1972	38.32	16.95	15.05	15.02	9.93	9.94	8.09	10.67	19.19	10.81
1971	42.69	16.00	16.35	14.87	8.24	8.40	7.19	10.82	20.42	10.53
1970	40.46	14.93	14.98	11.13	8.46	9.39	6.76	10.38	19.28	10.82

Table F3. Grade 3 means for each school for 1970-72: Word Attack Test and Number of Items

	CPT (60)	SAT WM (36)	SAT WSS (64)	C3 (15)	C4 (30)	C12 (15)	C5 (17)	C6 (15)	C16 (16)	D2 (18)
School 1										
1972	54.00	23.64	40.50	14.68	28.23	14.73	13.52	13.19	12.76	16.05
1971	52.67	23.43	38.14	14.84	26.20	14.28	13.11	14.05	13.05	16.53
1970	53.45	21.76	35.19	14.44	26.08	13.76	13.55	12.95	13.20	16.75
School 2										
1972	48.17	24.23	43.55	13.68	24.88	12.48	11.44	11.08	11.36	12.08
1971	49.48	21.08	40.20	13.86	23.59	13.41	11.78	10.83	9.22	12.30
1970	---	19.50	36.95	12.42	21.00	11.08	10.00	10.08	9.76	---
School 3										
1972	40.00	11.19	25.29	11.89	22.05	11.79	5.28	7.61	6.56	7.11
1971	40.71	10.48	24.38	12.52	22.87	12.91	5.87	7.91	7.26	6.48
1970	---	9.77	25.04	8.77	19.64	8.59	8.16	8.76	7.04	6.00
School 4										
1972	34.16	11.15	23.30	8.11	15.58	9.89	8.68	8.21	6.79	4.37
1971	36.68	---	---	8.00	14.63	9.88	5.57	7.76	6.33	6.95
1970	30.70	Other data not available								
School 5										
1972	45.79	18.94	33.28	13.05	22.85	13.05	11.11	10.74	10.11	11.47
1971	45.95	20.64	33.50	12.86	21.67	12.19	9.82	11.41	10.18	11.27
1970	Data not available									
School 6										
1972	51.42	20.95	43.05	14.48	26.48	13.74	14.24	13.95	9.71	15.43
1971	49.58	20.15	40.00	13.85	24.80	13.25	11.00	12.45	9.85	14.85
1970	45.38	---	---	10.95	17.00	10.41	8.87	10.53	8.13	11.27
School 8										
1972	40.08	12.52	28.88	9.72	19.40	9.56	7.56	9.72	6.48	8.92
1971	37.68	13.42	27.11	10.05	16.00	10.91	7.45	7.73	7.14	10.23
1970	Data not available									
COMBINED										
1972	44.80	17.52	33.98	12.23	22.78	12.18	10.26	10.64	9.11	10.78
1971	44.69	18.20	33.89	12.28	21.39	12.40	9.23	10.31	9.00	11.23
1970	43.18	17.01	32.39	11.64	20.93	10.96	10.14	10.58	9.53	11.34

Table F4. Grade 4 means for each school for 1971-72: Word Attack Test and Number of Items

	CTBS									
	Voc (40)	Comp (45)	C5 (17)	C6 (15)	C16 (16)	D2 (18)	D3 (15)	D4 (15)	D5 (20)	D7 (18)
School 1										
1972	32.32	34.59	14.44	13.72	13.52	16.28	9.90	11.67	11.38	11.86
1971	34.38	38.75	13.95	13.55	13.60	16.45	9.86	12.81	10.71	12.24
School 2										
1972	25.35	28.81	13.42	14.08	13.21	16.04	8.33	10.08	11.54	9.87
1971	22.96	28.44	12.92	12.76	12.36	14.88	8.84	10.72	11.12	9.40
School 3										
1972	19.67	24.62	15.52	13.35	8.04	13.30	5.87	11.17	9.78	10.96
1971	15.14	20.95	6.29	7.71	6.90	6.57	3.64	6.46	10.00	5.76
School 4										
1972	10.82	16.59	6.38	8.90	9.62	7.81	4.96	7.35	9.13	6.48
1971	---	---	6.79	7.26	7.26	7.00	4.69	6.00	8.88	6.75
School 5										
1972	24.59	28.29	12.42	11.58	12.58	13.00	6.56	10.44	10.39	9.72
1971	23.10	27.05	12.65	13.22	12.35	13.78	6.67	10.67	10.76	11.05
School 6										
1972	27.95	31.10	14.05	14.20	11.30	14.85	9.38	11.37	9.87	7.62
1971	21.60	26.16	12.30	12.89	10.89	13.63	6.40	9.88	9.36	5.88
COMBINED										
1972	23.45	27.33	12.71	12.64	11.38	13.55	7.50	10.35	10.35	9.42
1971	23.44	28.27	10.82	11.23	10.56	12.05	6.68	9.47	10.14	8.51

Table F5. Raw scores on study skills evaluation tests, November 1971

Grade 3

	B3	B5	B6	B7	C9	C10
School 1	11.25	10.68	12.77	13.00	11.17	11.75
School 2	10.30	10.75	12.29	11.54	8.57	8.17
School 3	7.92	7.76	9.90	10.76	5.17	5.21
School 4	7.07	6.83	9.39	7.39	3.73	3.80
School 5	8.48	10.46	12.08	11.79	7.67	8.29
School 6	9.00	10.08	11.54	10.71	6.75	6.54

Grade 4

	B5	B6	C2	C7	C8	C9
School 1	10.59	13.76	11.77	11.46	10.84	11.44
School 2	11.16	12.83	11.04	9.36	9.54	10.25
School 3	7.53	8.57	4.16	4.95	4.35	6.52
School 4	9.39	11.12	6.22	4.61	4.68	6.48
School 5	10.88	13.04	10.96	10.50	8.61	9.13
School 6	10.72	12.33	10.04	9.04	8.33	10.21

Grade 5

	B3	C4	D3	D4	D6	D8
School 1	11.52	9.90	12.52	12.05	12.19	10.29
School 2	10.48	8.32	10.64	11.70	10.39	8.96
School 3	9.87	5.09	7.17	5.57	5.11	4.71
School 4	6.84	4.00	7.47	9.25	6.81	5.06
School 5	11.64	9.28	11.64	10.23	9.15	8.42
School 6	10.00	8.52	12.24	7.89	6.89	6.22

Grade 6

	C2	C9	C10	D1	D7	D9
School 1	13.57	10.63	13.91	12.57	11.67	9.22
School 2	12.76	11.22	13.00	12.00	13.83	8.68
School 3	8.38	8.90	9.22	6.90	8.00	5.87
School 4	9.75	8.25	5.82	6.55	6.15	3.18
School 5	12.35	10.48	12.92	11.48	11.16	8.08
School 6	10.15	11.13	12.39	9.92	11.13	7.23

Grade 6, continued

	E1	E6	E7
School 1	10.95	13.08	13.09
School 2	10.76	14.61	12.73
School 3	5.05	6.40	7.26
School 4	3.70	6.80	3.95
School 5	9.30	12.04	11.79
School 6	6.65	12.42	9.81

Raw scores and grade equivalents on one subsection of the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills: Study skills evaluation

Grade 3, Form Q Level 1, Using Reference and Graphic Materials

	Raw score	Grade equivalent
School 1	20.00	4.2
School 2	12.73	3.0
School 3	10.64	2.7
School 4	8.15	2.1
School 5	12.44	2.9
School 6	12.59	3.0

Grade 4, Form Q Level 1, Using Reference and Graphic Materials

	Raw score	Grade equivalent
School 1	22.39	4.6
School 2	21.74	4.6
School 3	14.06	3.2
School 4	12.29	2.9
School 5	19.04	4.0
School 6	16.46	3.5

Grade 5, Form Q Level 2, Using Graphic Materials

	Raw score	Grade equivalent
School 1	17.48	5.0
School 2	16.17	4.8
School 3	7.44	2.6
School 4	10.67	3.7
School 5	16.12	4.8
School 6	16.80	5.0

Grade 6, Form Q Level 2, Using Graphic Materials

	Raw score	Grade equivalent
School 1	22.83	6.7
School 2	20.90	6.0
School 3	13.72	4.4
School 4	13.70	4.4
School 5	17.32	5.0
School 6	18.36	5.2

Cemrel, Inc.
Aesthetic Education Program

Teacher Questionnaire
Relating Sound and Movement

Introduction

A principal concern of CEMREL's Aesthetic Education Program is to design content based packages for aesthetic education that are capable of standing alone in the hands of elementary teachers who are not arts specialists. A particular package will be judged to be capable of standing alone, so to speak, to the degree that: (a) the prescribed instructional materials and suggested procedures lead to the desired learning or experiences on the part of the students, (b) the teacher's guide and other accompanying materials provide the necessary explanation, support or background for the successful implementation of the prescribed instructional procedures, and (c) the time and effort expended in preparation and classroom instruction are judged by teachers to be within the practical requirements of elementary school scheduling.

In short, will teachers find these Aesthetic Education materials both desirable and practical to use? Will they be able, solely on the basis of the materials and instructions provided, to successfully carry out the suggested instructional activities and in addition be able to assess the degree of their success? With this perspective in mind, we would ask you to answer the following questions.

NOTE: In several instances SAMPLE RESPONSES to questions have been provided in order to assist YOU in responding to the questions.

Descriptive Information

Identification

Teacher's Name_____

Grade Level of Students who received instruction with Aesthetic Education Materials_____

School Name_____

Street_____

City and State_____

Zip_____

Principal's Name_____

School Phone 1-_____-_____
area code

Special Qualifications

Do you feel that you have any special qualifications in the arts* that would give you an advantage, in comparison to your peers, in comprehending and teaching the Aesthetic Education Materials that are the subject of this questionnaire?

YES ☐ NO ☐

If you checked YES, please comment on your qualifications below:

_____

_____

_____

_____

*Examples of special qualifications might be:

(a) You may have had some concentration in the arts in college.

(b) You may participate in a local theatre group--perhaps have directed plays.

(c) You may have had several years of instruction in dance, or with a musical instrument, etc.

General Questions

Grade level; class and teacher time

Comment on the grade level for which this package is best suited. (Check the appropriate grade(s) -- you may check more than one.)

K ☐ 2 ☐ 4 ☐
1 ☐ 3 ☐ 5 ☐

Would you estimate as accurately as possible the amount of instructional or class time you spent on the package [i.e., say for example that you spent nine periods or sessions on the materials and student activities--average 45 minutes per period--for a total of approximately 6 and 3/4 hours of class time]. (Please fill in the following.)

(a) Number of Periods spent on Instruction (CHECK ONE)

5-6 ☐ 9-10 ☐ 13-14 ☐ 17-18 ☐
7-8 ☐ 11-12 ☐ 15-16 ☐ 19-or more ☐

(b) Average time (MINUTES) spent per Period (CHECK ONE)

15-19 ☐ 25-29 ☐ 35-39 ☐ 45-49 ☐
20-24 ☐ 30-34 ☐ 40-44 ☐ 50-or more ☐

(c) Estimate of total time (HOURS) spent on package (CHECK ONE)

3-4 ☐ 7-8 ☐ 11-12 ☐ 15-16 ☐
5-6 ☐ 9-10 ☐ 13-14 ☐ 17-or more ☐

Would you estimate the total amount of teacher preparation time (HOURS) that was involved over the "duration" of your work with the package. (CHECK ONE)

1 ☐ 3 ☐ 5 ☐ 7 ☐
2 ☐ 4 ☐ 6 ☐ 8 or more ☐

Scheduling of Instruction

a. During which TIME OF THE DAY did you usually teach the package? Mark only one square, unless instruction considerably extended into a second period, then mark two squares.

☐ Early morning (before 10:00) ☐ Early afternoon (12:30 - 1:30)
☐ Mid-morning (10:00 - 11:00) ☐ Mid-afternoon (1:30 - 2:30)
☐ Late morning (11:00 - 12:00) ☐ Late afternoon (after 2:30)
☐ Noon (12:00 - 12:30) ☐ Scheduled too varied to specify

b. To what degree did your SCHEDULE for teaching the package VARY or differ from the time period that you indicated above?

☐ a great deal ☐ somewhat ☐ only slightly ☐ none

c. Which CLASS(ES), if any, was/were usually or normally replaced by the time used for the package lessons? Mark more than one square if appropriate (for example, if one group normally had gym when the other group had art or if your schedule varied.)

☐ Art ☐ Science ☐ Language Arts
☐ Music ☐ Mathematics ☐ Free time and/or non-alloted time
☐ Gym ☐ Social Studies ☐ Other (specify) _____

d. Which of the following best describes your PATTERN OF WORKING with the Aesthetic Education Program materials on a WEEK TO WEEK basis?

We usually conducted lessons:

☐ Daily ☐ Twice a week
☐ Four times a week ☐ Once a week or less
☐ Three days a week ☐ Other (specify) _____

e. How many weeks did you work with the package? (i.e., the number of weeks that passed from the time that you started to the time that you finished, regardless of how much time you spent per week.)

☐ 1-2 ☐ 5-6 ☐ 9-10 ☐ other (specify) _____
☐ 3-4 ☐ 7-8 ☐ 11-12

Evaluation of Teacher's Guide

Would you comment on the degree to which the teacher's guide (and other relevant package materials) satisfied your needs in regard to each of the following areas:

(a) The guide explained or taught you the content that you were to teach to your students:
(Check one.)

- ☐ quite adequate
- ☐ slightly inadequate
- ☐ adequate
- ☐ inadequate

(b) The guide explained how the content or package was related to aesthetic education:
(Check one.)

- ☐ quite adequate
- ☐ slightly inadequate
- ☐ adequate
- ☐ inadequate

(c) The guide outlined the suggested procedures for instruction:
(Check one.)

- ☐ quite adequate
- ☐ slightly inadequate
- ☐ adequate
- ☐ inadequate

(d) The guide laid out criteria that enabled you to assess student learning at key points of instruction:
(Check one.)

- ☐ quite adequate
- ☐ slightly inadequate
- ☐ adequate
- ☐ inadequate

Would you comment on the ease with which you were able to abstract the above information (a-d) from the teacher's guide.

I thought that the guide was:
(Check One)

- ☐ very well organized (no revisions needed)
- ☐ somewhat organized (moderate rewriting needed)
- ☐ well organized (minor rewriting needed)
- ☐ poorly organized (major rewriting needed)

Workshop

One of CEMREL's concerns is whether or not a teacher workshop is required prior to package use, to facilitate the implementation of the package materials with the appropriate instructional impact and teacher understanding. What is your feeling in regard to this package?

Insofar as this package is concerned I feel that a teacher workshop is:

- ☐ Completely unnecessary
- ☐ Probably unnecessary
- ☐ Probably advisable
- ☐ Highly advisable
- ☐ I am undecided

Student Reactions

Overall, how did your students react to the package?
The majority of my students (CHECK ONE)

- were quite excited about each lesson. ☐
- looked forward to each lesson. ☐
- were ambivilent in their response to the lessons. ☐
- exhibited a lack of enthusiasm for the lessons. ☐

Recommendations

Would you recommend this package to other teachers?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Would you recommend this package to other teachers if it was modified?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Comment briefly on recommended modifications.

Reaction to Package Materials

a. In general, did either you or your class have any difficulties in physically using the package materials?

☐ none ☐ few ☐ some ☐ many

If problems were present, identify materials and describe nature of difficulty (materials too large; demanded too much dexterity; etc.). Indicate whether the problem was yours (T) or the students (S).

MATERIALS	PROBLEMS

Please give any recommendations you might have.

b. Was the general quantity of materials sufficient for the needs of your class?

☐ yes ☐ usually ☐ no

What is the number in your class? _____

Specify those materials, if any, that were in short supply and suggest preferred material/student ratio for each.

c. What was your overall impression of the appearance of the materials graphically?

☐ outstanding ☐ good ☐ fair ☐ poor

List any materials for which graphics affected the instruction to any extent either positively or negatively.

MATERIALS	AFFECT OF GRAPHICS

d. In general, how well do you feel the materials are able to withstand normal use?

☐ excellently ☐ well ☐ fairly ☐ poorly

Specify those materials whose durability you question, giving the nature of the problems.

MATERIALS	PROBLEMS OF DURABILITY

Package Storage

Where was the package normally stored when not in use during the duration of the period of instruction?

In room: ☐ on floor ☐ on table/shelf, in cabinet, etc.

☐ in closet or adjoining room ☐ other location

Was storage of the package a problem?

☐ yes ☐ no

If yes, comment and give suggestion for improvement, if any.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Self-initiated Student Involvement

For the following questions indicate the approximate percentage (part) of the class who demonstrated each kind of initiative specified. Interpret the terms below as falling into the following categories: none; few, under one-fourth; some, one-fourt to one-half; many, one-half to three-fourths; most or all, over three-fourths.

How many students:

	None	Few	Some	Many	Most or A
a. brought package revelant materials from home?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. voluntarily worked with the package materials between regular lessons? (free periods, lunch hours, etc.)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. volunteered to do additional suggested activities outside of regular class time?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. raised questions related to the package, not covered in the regular activities?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. tried to relate or generalize the content of the package to other school subjects?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. other?	_____				
	_____				

Repeated Use?

What is your opinion in regard to using the same package more than once with a given class? That is, do you think that there would be anything to be gained by covering the same ground twice, but perhaps in more depth the second time around?

Assume that this second exposure occurs four months, six months, or even a year after the first exposure.

What do you think could be gained by a second exposure to this package?

Please comment briefly.

Part 2:
Specific Questions for Relating Sound and Movement

Assessment of Student Learning

In general, how well were you able to assess student learning during the course of instruction? Were you able to determine if the students had learned the concepts, skills, or awarenesses that comprised the goals or outcomes of the various activities or segments of instruction?

I feel that I had: (CHECK ONE)

- no problems ☐
- only a few problems ☐
- several problems ☐
- quite a few problems ☐

.... in assessing student learning.

Rate each of the following lessons or activities in terms of the difficulties or problems that you had in assessing student learning during the course of instruction. [CHECK ONLY ONE BOX IN EACH ROW]

ACTIVITY BY LESSON	DIFFICULTY IN ASSESSING LEARNING? None	Minimal	Moderate	Great
Lesson 1. Tape and film pretest: high-low, fast-slow, and loud-soft/strong-weak sounds and movements.	☐	☐	☐	☐
Lesson 2. Listen to and produce sounds. Discriminate among the three sound continuums.	☐	☐	☐	☐
Lesson 3. Work with Continuum Book, body movements, and shadows.	☐	☐	☐	☐
Lesson 4. Matching sounds and movements.	☐	☐	☐	☐
Lesson 5. Contrasting sounds and movements.	☐	☐	☐	☐
Lesson 6. Integration and evaluation	☐	☐	☐	☐
Lesson 7. View and discuss the film, Fogarty Park.	☐	☐	☐	☐

Relative Preference for Activities

The next question is a forced choice rating question!

Please rank the following lessons or activities according to the degree to which you feel that your students liked or responded favorable to them.

Rate the most liked activity "1," the second most liked "2," etc. Give each lesson or activity a single number and use each number only once. Place your responses in "Column A."

In addition, if you feel that the majority of your students actively disliked a given lesson or activity, please place an "X" in "Column B."

In the SAMPLE ITEM below, Game 1 was liked the most and Lesson 3 the least. Lesson 3 was also actively disliked.

SAMPLE ITEM

LESSON OR ACTIVITY	COLUMN A (Forced Rating) Degree of Liking	COLUMN B Parts Disliked
Lesson 1	4	___
Lesson 2	5	___
Lesson 3	7	X
Activity Book A	3	___
Activity Book B	6	___
Game 1	1	___
Game 2	2	___

FILL IN THE ITEMS BELOW

YOUR RESPONSES

LESSON OR ACTIVITY	COLUMN A Forced Rating Degree of Liking	COLUMN B Parts Disliked
Lesson 1. Tape and film pretest: high-low, fast-slow, and loud-soft/strong-weak sounds and movements.	___	___
Lesson 2. Listen to and produce sounds. Discriminate among the three sound continuums.	___	___
Lesson 3. Work with Continuum Book, body movements, and shadows.	___	___
Lesson 4. Matching sounds and movements.	___	___
Lesson 5. Contrasting sounds and movements.	___	___
Lesson 6. Integration and evaluation.	___	___
Lesson 7. View and discuss the film, Fogarty Park.	___	___

Forced"Modifications of Lessons

At times you may have found it necessary or desirable to deviate from the recommended teaching procedures in order to bolster or maintain the continuity or momentum of the unit.

(a) To what degree, if any, were you FORCED TO DEVIATE from or modify the recommended teaching procedures because they obviously were not having the desired effects on your students?

Please indicate the degree of forced modification, if any, that was required for each of the following lessons or activities.

LESSON OR ACTIVITY	DEGREE OF FORCED MODIFICATION			
	None	Minimal	Moderate	Great
Lesson 1. Tape and film pretest: high-low, fast-slow, and loud-soft/strong-weak sounds and movements.	☐	☐	☐	☐
Lesson 2. Listen to and produce sounds. Discriminate among the three sound continuums.	☐	☐	☐	☐
Lesson 3. Work with Continuum Book, body movements, and shadows.	☐	☐	☐	☐
Lesson 4. Matching sounds and movements.	☐	☐	☐	☐
Lesson 5. Contrasting sounds and movements.	☐	☐	☐	☐
Lesson 6. Integration and evaluation.	☐	☐	☐	☐
Lesson 7. View and discuss the film, Fogarty Park.	☐	☐	☐	☐

Please elaborate on the kinds of "forced" modifications you made, in the space to the right, if you feel they might be helpful; especially if they were moderate or great. Also, specify the reasons for your changes if possible.

*LESSON OR *ACTIVITY	KINDS OF "FORCED" MODIFICATIONS
____	_____
____	_____
____	_____
____	_____
____	_____
____	_____
____	_____
____	_____
____	_____
____	_____
____	_____
____	_____
____	_____
____	_____
____	_____
____	_____
____	_____
____	_____

*Use as many lines as you need for each lesson or activity. Write in the number of the activity only for the first line of comments for each activity.

"Exploratory" Modifications of Lessons

(b) To what degree, if any, did you choose to deviate from or MODIFY the RECOMMENDED TEACHING PROCEDURES because you wanted to try out a different way of presenting something, etc.?

Please indicate the degree of "free choice" or "exploratory" deviation or modification that you engaged in when teaching each of the following lessons or activities.

LESSON OR ACTIVITY	DEGREE OF EXPLORATORY MODIFICATION			
	None	Minimal	Moderate	Considerable
Lesson 1. Tape and film pretest: high-low, fast-slow, and loud-soft/strong-weak sounds and movements.	☐	☐	☐	☐
Lesson 2. Listen to and produce sounds. Discriminate among the three sound continuums.	☐	☐	☐	☐
Lesson 3. Work with Continuum Book, body movements, and shadows.	☐	☐	☐	☐
Lesson 4. Matching sounds and movements.	☐	☐	☐	☐
Lesson 5. Contrasting sounds and movements.	☐	☐	☐	☐
Lesson 6. Integration and evaluation.	☐	☐	☐	☐
Lesson 7. View and discuss the film, Fogarty Park.	☐	☐	☐	☐

Please elaborate on the kinds of "free choice" or "exploratory" modifications you made, in the space to the right, if you feel they might be helpful; especially if they were moderate or great. Also, specify the reasons for your changes if possible.

*LESSON OR ACTIVITY	KINDS OF "EXPLORATORY" MODIFICATIONS
____	_____
____	_____
____	_____
____	_____
____	_____
____	_____
____	_____
____	_____
____	_____
____	_____
____	_____
____	_____
____	_____
____	_____
____	_____
____	_____

*Use as many lines as you need for each lesson or activity. Write in the number of the activity only for the first line of comments for each activity.

ease of Reading for Students

lid any of the components of the package present any particular reading difficulties for your students?

Yes ☐ No ☐

f you checked Yes, please complete the following. Check off one box in each ow. If no reading was required, place a check in the first column.

LESSON OR ACTIVITY	RATING OF READABILITY			
	No Reading Required	No Problems	Moderate Problems	Major Problems
esson 1. Tape and film pretest: high-low, fast-slow, and loud-soft/strong-weak sounds and movements.	☐	☐	☐	☐
esson 2. Listen to and produce sounds. Discriminate among the three sound continuums.	☐	☐	☐	☐
esson 3. Work with Continuum Book, body movements, and shadows.	☐	☐	☐	☐
esson 4. Matching sounds and movements.	☐	☐	☐	☐
esson 5. Contrasting sounds and movements.	☐	☐	☐	☐
esson 6. Integration and evaluation.	☐	☐	☐	☐
esson 7. View and discuss the film, Fogarty Park.	☐	☐	☐	☐

Recommended Changes in Sequence of Lessons/Activities

Would you recommend changing the sequence in which the various lessons or activities in the package are introduced?

In Column A, please number the parts of the package to indicate the consecutive order in which you feel they should be taught. (Column B contains a Sample Response to illustrate the format of the desired response.)

LESSON OR ACTIVITY	Column A Your Response	Column B Sample Response
Lesson 1. Tape and film pretest: high-low, fast-slow, and loud-soft/strong-weak sounds and movements.	___	1
Lesson 2. Listen to and produce sounds. Discriminate among the three sound continuums.	___	2
Lesson 3. Work with Continuum Book, body movements, and shadows.	___	3
Lesson 4. Matching sounds and movements.	___	6
Lesson 5. Contrasting sounds and movements.	___	7
Lesson 6. Integration and evaluation.	___	4
Lesson 7. View and discuss the film, Fogarty Park.	___	5

Evaluation of Instrumentation

The evaluation component of CEMREL's Aesthetic packages represents an auxiliary but important aspect of the package's development and presentability. As this component is one of the more problematical, considering the elusive nature of aesthetics, your tabulation and commentary will be especially appreciated for this section.

FOR EACH SUBTEST BELOW WITHIN CATEGORY, MARK THE ANSWER WHICH YOU FEEL IS MOST APPROPRIATE.

a. Length of Test Time	Too Long	Rather Long	Fairly Good	Nicely Brief
Sound pretest (tape)	☐	☐	☐	☐
Movement pretest (film)	☐	☐	☐	☐
Evaluation activities: Lesson 6	☐	☐	☐	☐

b. Clarity of Directions	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Sound pretest (tape)	☐	☐	☐	☐
Movement pretest (film)	☐	☐	☐	☐
Evaluation activities: Lesson 6	☐	☐	☐	☐

c. Ease of Administration	Very Simple	Rather Simple	Somewhat Difficult	Quite Difficult
Sound pretest (tape)	☐	☐	☐	☐
Movement pretest (film)	☐	☐	☐	☐
Evaluation activities: Lesson 6	☐	☐	☐	☐

d. Ease of Scoring	Very Simple	Rather Simple	Somewhat Difficult	Quite Difficult
Sound pretest (tape)	☐	☐	☐	☐
Movement pretest (film)	☐	☐	☐	☐
Evaluation activities: Lesson 6	☐	☐	☐	☐

e. Utility of Results (Usefulness in assessing student growth)	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Sound pretest (tape)	☐	☐	☐	☐
Movement pretest (film)	☐	☐	☐	☐
Evaluation activities: Lesson 6	☐	☐	☐	☐

f. The tests used with CEMREL's Aesthetic Education packages vary in terms of their inclusiveness in providing information regarding the achievement of package goals. How comprehensive was the instrumentation accompanying this package? Did it provide information regarding student performance across all major goals? (As you understood them.)

The instrumentation [test(s)] was:
(Check One.)

☐ Very Comprehensive ☐ Comprehensive ☐ Not too Comprehensive ☐ Not at all Comprehens

g. Do you feel that the instructional outcomes of any of the lessons or activities are of such a nature that they probably cannot be measured by objective tests? If so, please check such lessons or activities below:

ACTIVITY OR LESSON

☐ Lesson 1. Tape and film pretest: high-low, fast-slow, and loud-soft/strong-weak sounds and movements.

☐ Lesson 2. Listen to and produce sounds. Discriminate among the three sound continuums.

☐ Lesson 3. Work with Continuum Book, body movements, and shadows.

☐ Lesson 4. Matching sounds and movements.

☐ Lesson 5. Contrasting sounds and movements.

☐ Lesson 6. Integration and evaluation.

☐ Lesson 7. View and discuss the film, Fogarty Park.

Please add any additional comments you wish to make regarding evaluation in the space below. Indicate Lesson Activity and/or Subtest if relevant.

Please complete this last page if you have taught more than one Aesthetic Education Package.

Packages Taught / Order Taught
Teacher and Student Preferences

1. Indicate the PACKAGES THAT YOU HAVE TAUGHT during the current school year by placing a check in Column 1.
2. Indicate the ORDER in which you TAUGHT them in Column 2.
3. Rank order the packages in terms of YOUR PREFERENCE in Column 3.
4. Rank order the packages in terms of YOUR STUDENTS' PREFERENCES in Column 4.

In the SAMPLE RESPONSE for instance, a teacher reported that SHE TAUGHT The Choreographer first, Investigating the Elements Meter second, and Creating Characterization third. SHE LIKED Meter the most, Characterization next most and Choreographer the least (Column 3). HER STUDENTS LIKED Choreographer the most, Meter next most, and Creating Characterization the least.

Please fill in your responses.....

AEP PACKAGES / Column...	* YOUR RESPONSE * 1 Taught	2 Order Taught	3 Tchr. Pref.	4 Student Pref.	SAMPLE RESPONSE 1 Taught	2 Order Taught	3 Tchr. Pref.	4 Student Pref.
The Composer	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The Choreographer	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	1	3	1
Constructing Dramatic Plot	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Creating Word Pictures	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Creating Characterization	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	3	2	3
Relating Sound and Movement	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Investigating the Elements:								
Meter	☐	☐	☐	☐	☑	2	1	2
Aural Texture	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Texure: Tactile/Visual	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Examining Tension: Suspense	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Extended Use of Packages

Have you taught any of the Aesthetic Education packages more than once? (i.e., to different classes)

☐ Yes ☐ No

If you checked "Yes" please indicate the number of times that you have taught each package.

In the SAMPLE RESPONSE a teacher stated that she taught The Composer to two classes and Creating Characterization to three different classes...

Please fill in your response...

AEP PACKAGES	YOUR RESPONSE	SAMPLE RESPONSE
The Composer	☐	2
The Choreographer	☐	☐
Constructing Dramatic Plot	☐	☐
Creating Word Pictures	☐	☐
Creating Characterization	☐	3
Relating Sound and Movement	☐	☐
Investigating the Elements:		
Meter	☐	☐
Aural Texture	☐	☐
Texture: Tactile/Visual	☐	☐
Examining Tension: Suspense	☐	☐